

The “angel sent from before the Lord” in *Targum Joshua* 5,14

Studying the way Aramaic Targums deal with the phenomenon of angels and other heavenly creatures in the Bible can reveal much about the faith and beliefs of worshippers ¹ and scholars ² of the time in which they were redacted. In an earlier study ³ we examined beliefs about angels in Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch and analyzed the Aramaic translations of the term מלאך/מלאכים (“angel”/“angels”) when it appears explicitly in the Pentateuch, both in the meaning of an emissary of flesh and blood, and in the meaning of a non-corporeal one. We also examined all the Targum sources that inserted an “angel” into their translation where it did not appear in the original Hebrew Pentateuch.

The study revealed that, in most of the cases where the term “angel” does appear explicitly in the Pentateuch, it is translated literally, without any additions. In a few cases, the Targums supplement the term “angel” as it appears in the Pentateuch with a name, title, function or quantifier. Such additions appear only in the Palestinian Targumic versions, whereas *Targum Onqelos* remains faithful in translation throughout the Pentateuch translations. Our study found 42 instances altogether where the Targumic sources inserted an “angel” into their translation of a biblical story. When an “angel”

¹ See A. SHINAN, “Knesset Ezra”, *Literature and Life in the Synagogue*. Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer (eds. S. ELIZUR – M.D. HERR – G. SHAKED – A. SHINAN) (Jerusalem 1994) 135 (Hebrew); n. 18 emphasizes the relationship between the Targums and the reading of the Torah. See also A. SHINAN, *The Embroidered Targum*. The Aggadah in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch (Jerusalem 1992) 14 (Hebrew); F.G. VOLTAGGIO, *La oración de los padres y las madres de Israel*. Investigación en el Targum del Pentateuco. La antigua tradición judía y los orígenes del cristianismo (BMid 33; Estella [Navarra] 2010) 31-35.

² See R. KASHER, “The Aramaic Targums of the Bible”, *Peamim* 83 (1999) 75-85 (Hebrew). The Targums were studied early on and alongside the Bible as part of the training of Torah scholars; see, for example, on Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkay in *Sof* 16:8: “He studied Bible and Targum, Midrash, *halakhot*, *aggadot* and allegories; he studied everything”.

³ Y. AZUELOS, *The Angelology of the Aramaic Targums on the Pentateuch* (Dissertation, Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies; Jerusalem 2002) (Hebrew).

did not appear in the original text, it seems that the Targumists used the addition as a literary device to solve textual problems ⁴, fill gaps in the storyline ⁵, and bypass theological issues ⁶, as well as a stratagem in anti-Christian polemics ⁷. In sum, our analysis uncovered dynamic angelological actions in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, standing in contrast with the reserve of *Targum Onqelos*, which made an effort to avoid adding angels into biblical verses where they did not specifically appear.

In this article, we elaborate upon our earlier study of angelology in the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch and analyze the translation and approach of the *Targum Jonathan* to the term מלאך/מלאכים (“angel”/“angels”) in the Book of Joshua. Our aim is to reveal the angelological world of *Targum Jonathan* in the Book of Joshua and its relationship to the angelology of the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch.

I. “Angels” in the Targum of Joshua

A search for the specific word מלאך/מלאכים (“angel”/“angels”) in Joshua yields meager results. It only appears twice in 6,25 and 7,22.

Josh 6,25:

“But Rahab the prostitute, with her family and all who belonged to her, Joshua spared. Her family has lived in Israel ever since. For she hid the messengers whom Joshua sent to spy out Jericho”.

Targum Jonathan ⁸:

וית רחב פנדקיתא וית בית אבוהא וית כל דלה קיים יהושע ויתבת בנו בני ישראל עד יומא הדין ארי אשמרת ית אזגדיא דשלח יהושע לאללל ית יריחו.

⁴ Cf. *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 18,10; 19,26; 22,19; 32,33.

⁵ Cf. *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 1,26.

⁶ Cf. *Tg. Ps.-J. and Tg. Neof. Gen* 3,5; *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 18,15; 31,24; 32,3.29.31; 33,10; 35,7; *Exod* 4,24-26.

⁷ Cf. *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 1,26; 35,7.

⁸ The texts of *Tg. J.* are from A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. II. The Former Prophets According to Targum Jonathan (Leiden 1959); for translations into modern languages, see D.J. HARRINGTON – A.J. SALDARINI, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*

“And Rahab the innkeeper, and the house of her father, and all that were hers, Joshua kept alive. And she dwelt in the midst of the children of Israel until this day, because she hid the messengers whom Joshua sent to spy out Jericho”.

Josh 7,22:

“So Joshua sent messengers, and they ran to the tent; and there it was, hidden in his tent with the silver underneath”.

Targum Jonathan:

ושלח יהושע אזגדין ורהטו למשכנא והא טמירין במשכניה וכספא תחותיהון.

“Then Joshua sent messengers and they ran to the tent and behold, they were hidden in his tent, and the silver was under them”.

In both cases, these are angels of flesh and blood, who perform a mission assigned to them by Joshua. In both cases, *Targum Jonathan* translates the term “angels” as אזגדיא or אזגדין (“messengers”), the commonly used term for flesh and blood angels in *Targum Onqelos*, as well as in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* of the Pentateuch⁹.

Although the appearance of flesh and blood angels is mentioned specifically only twice in the Book of Joshua, and while the term “angel/angels” understood as a non-corporeal emissary of God does not appear at all in Joshua, another heavenly being, named שר צבא יהוה, “the commander of the Lord’s army”, appears in Josh 5,15, and is translated in *Targum Jonathan* as “an angel sent from before the Lord” (מלאך שליח מן קדם יי). We discuss this being in detail below, since it is our opinion that a discussion of angels in the Book of Joshua and a comparison with other biblical texts and their translations can contribute to a fuller understanding of the angelological world of the Aramaic Targums.

The insertion of the term “angel” in Targumic versions, even when it does not appear explicitly in the original biblical text, is

(ArBib 10; Wilmington, DE – Edinburgh 1987); E. MARTÍNEZ BOROBIO, *Targum Jonatán de los Profetas Primeros en tradición babilónica*, I. Josué – Jueces (CSIC.TE 46; Madrid 1989).

⁹ Cf. *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 32,7; Num 20,14; 21,21; 22,5; 24,12; Deut 2,26. For each of these verses, *Tg. Neof.* translates “messengers” (שליחין), except in Gen 32,7, where the term “spies” (מללן[יה]) occurs instead.

known from *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* of the Pentateuch¹⁰. In the case at hand, as we shall see, the logic used by *Targum Jonathan* in translating שר־צבא־יהוה (“the commander of the Lord’s army”) as an angel of the Lord does not constitute such an addition, and thus we cannot say that the term “angel” which does not occur in the biblical text was added in translation.

In light of these textual findings, it is possible to conclude that the angelology in *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua centers on the scene where the “commander of the Lord’s army” appears before Joshua with a drawn sword.

II. The interpretation of שר־צבא־יהוה (“commander of the Lord’s army”) in the *Targum*

Josh 5,13-15:

“Once when Joshua was by Jericho, he looked up and saw a man standing before him with a drawn sword in his hand. Joshua went to him and said to him: ‘Are you one of us, or one of our adversaries?’. He replied: ‘Neither, but as commander of the army of the Lord I have now come’. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth and worshiped, and he said to him: ‘What do you command your servant, my lord?’. The commander of the army of the Lord said to Joshua: ‘Remove the sandals from your feet, for the place where you stand is holy’. And Joshua did so”.

The appearance of the commander of the Lord’s army before Joshua mirrors the appearance of God before Moses in the burning bush in Exodus 3. The scene is intentionally structured to show Joshua as “a reflection of Moses”¹¹. However, while Moses is sanctified through the direct revelation of God’s words, Joshua is merely visited by a “man” (אִישׁ, v. 13) who identifies himself as the “commander of the army of the Lord.” (שר־צבא־יהוה, v. 14)¹². Who is

¹⁰ See notes 4, 5, 6 and 7 above.

¹¹ S. AHITUV, *Joshua*. Introduction and Commentary (Miqra leYisra’el; Tel Aviv – Jerusalem 1995) 109 (Hebrew).

¹² See Y. ZAKOVITCH, “Rationalization of Miracle Motifs in Biblical Narrative”, *Proceedings of the Ninth World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem 1985)*. Panel Session: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East (eds. M.H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN – D. ASSAF) (Jerusalem 1988) 27-28 (Hebrew); A. ROFÉ,

this “man”? What is his function here? In Josh 5,13, *Targum Jonathan* translates the term אִישׁ literally as גַּבְרָא.

Targum Jonathan Josh 5,13:

וְהוּא כִּד הוּא יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בִּירִיחוֹ וּזְקַף עֵינָוְהִי וְחָזָא וְהָא גַבְרָא קָאִים לְקַבְלִיהּ וְחַרְבִּיהּ
שְׁלִיפָא בִירִידָהּ וְאָזַל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ לִוְחִידָהּ וְאָמַר לִיהּ הֲלִמְסַעֲדָנָא אִתִּיתָ אִם לְבַעֲלִי דְבַבְנָא.

“Then it came about when Joshua was near Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and saw and behold, a man was standing in front of him and his sword was drawn in his hand. So Joshua went to him and said to him: ‘Have you come to support us or our enemies?’”.

The opening of the revelation scene in Joshua is reminiscent, in its literary structure, of the scene of the three angels appearing before Abraham in Genesis 18. In Josh 5,13, Joshua “looked up and saw a man standing before him” and, in Gen 18,2, Abraham “looked up and saw three men standing before him”. Further on in both texts, it becomes clear that the “man” appearing to Joshua and the “men” appearing to Abraham are angels. However, in Genesis the identification is explicit: Abraham’s visitors are identified explicitly as “angels” in Gen 19,1. This is not the case in Joshua.

In Josh 5,14-15, the term “man” (אִישׁ) is translated by *Targum Jonathan* as “the angel sent from before the Lord” (מַלְאָכָא דְשְׁלִיחַ מִן) (קֳדָם יְיָ). Presumably, the term used in the translation changes at this stage because the “man” appearing to Joshua names himself the “commander of the army of the Lord,” and can thereafter be identified as an angel of the Lord.

A targumic *tosefta* to Josh 5,13 from the Genizah differs substantially from *Targum Jonathan*, which, as noted, initially maintains the literal translation of אִישׁ as גַּבְרָא. It is only in the second stage of the story that the “man” (אִישׁ) is identified as an angel of the Lord, thereby giving the impression that Joshua is initially unaware of the true identity of the figure standing before him and believes him to be an ordinary “man” whom he addresses forcefully. Only after the “man” identifies himself as the “commander of the army of the Lord,” does Joshua’s demeanor change as he falls to the ground before him in awe. The Genizah *tosefta*, in contrast, im-

“Joshua Son of Nun in the History of Biblical Tradition”, *Tarb.* 73 (2003-2004) 333-364 (Hebrew).

mediately identifies the **אִישׁ** as an angel, thereby eliding the transformation between the two stages of the event.

The identification of the term **אִישׁ** with angels also appears in translations of other verses of the Pentateuch, when the expressions **אִישׁ** or **אֲנָשִׁים** are identified with angels in the biblical or midrashic traditions¹³. For such verses, **אִישׁ** is translated in *Targum Onqelos* as **נְבִרָא** or **נְבִרָיָא** and as “angels” in the Palestinian Targums. Below are a number of examples.

1. In the various Aramaic Targums of Genesis 18,1¹⁴, each of the translations — *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Targum Neofiti*, *Marginal Glossa* of the *Targum Neofiti* and the *Fragmentary Targum* (mss. Vatican 440 and Paris 110) — opens with an extended introduction that describes the three angels who stood before Abraham and the roles assigned to each of them: the announcement to Sarah, the rescue of Lot, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah¹⁵. With the exception of *Targum Onqelos*, Abraham’s visitors (“three men standing before him”: Gen 18,2) are treated as angels sent by the Lord¹⁶ in all the Targums, which are also characterized by the angels’ anonymity. In the corresponding midrashic texts, in contrast, they appear

¹³ *BerR* 50:2 maintains the change in names: “men” for Abraham, “angels” for Lot. For further discussion of the interchanging of men and angels, see Y. RAHMAN, “The Story of Sodom and Gomorrah in the Light of Traditional Interpretation”, *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters*. Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume (ed. S. YAFET) (Jerusalem 1994) 463-466 (Hebrew); cf. also R. WEISS, *Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible* (Jerusalem 1981) 91-93 (Hebrew).

¹⁴ For an extensive analysis of Gen 18,1-16 in both the Midrash and Targums, see W.T. MILLER, *Mysterious Encounters at Mamre and Jabbok* (BJSt 50; Chico, CA 1984) 8-37.

¹⁵ Cf. *BerR* 50:2, where the duties of the angels are: the announcement to Sarah, the healing of Abraham, and the destruction of Sodom.

¹⁶ *Tg. Onq.*: **וְהָאָנְשִׁים תְּלָתָא נְבִרָיָא**; *Tg. Ps.-J.*: **וְהָאָנְשִׁים בְּרִמּוֹת נְבִרָיָא**; *Tg. Neof.*: **וְהָאָנְשִׁים בְּרִמּוֹת נְבִרָיָא**; *Frg. Tg.* [Paris 110]: **וְתַלְתִּיהוֹן מְלָאכִין בְּרִמּוֹת נְבִרָיָא**. The translation of the Midrash fragments on Genesis from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q180) is similar: see WEISS, *Studies*, 218-220; J.M. ALLEGRO – A.A. ANDERSON, *Qumrân Cave 4:I (4Q 158-4Q 186)* (DJD 5; Oxford 1968) 78-79, who read 4Q180 2-4 II,3-4 as follows: “3.[...] three me[n...] 4. [who appeared to Abra]m at the oaks of Mamre: were angels” ([...] **אֲנָשִׁים** [...]).

with their names: Michael, Gabriel and Rafael¹⁷. Moreover, not only each angel is named, but his mission is also spelled out, as, for example, in *b.BM* 86b:

“Michael who came to announce to Sarah, Raphael who came to heal Abraham, Gabriel who came to destroy Sodom”

מיכאל שבא לבשר את שרה רפאל שבא לרפא את אברהם גבריאל
אזל למהפכיה לסדום).

It is made clear that each of the angels has his assigned task, although the number of angels changes through Genesis 18–19¹⁸ from three (18,1) to two (19,1) and finally to one (19,24)¹⁹.

2. The “man” wrestling with Jacob in Gen 32,25 (“a man wrestled with him until daybreak”) and identified by the prophet Hosea as an angel (Hos 12,4-5) is translated literally in *Targum Onkelos* as גברא, while in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* he is described as “an angel (...) in the form of a man” (מלאכא [...] בדמות גבר). *Targum Neofiti* goes as far as naming the wrestling angel “Sariel”.

3. The “man” who meets Joseph as he wanders lost in Gen 37,15 (“and a man found him wandering in the fields”) is translated literally as גברא in *Targum Onkelos*, while in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* he is named as the angel Gabriel: גבריאל בדמות גברא (“Gabriel in the form of a man”)²⁰.

¹⁷ See *BerR* 50:2; *b.BM* 86b.

¹⁸ The unclear number of divine guests is present also in the parallel Ugaritic text of the “Aqhat Epic” (or “Legend of Danel”); on this subject, see P. XELLA, “L’épisode de Danil et Kothar et Genèse 18,1-16”, *VT* 28 (1978) 483-488; Y. AVISHUR, “The Story of the Visit of the Angels to Abraham (Gn 18,1-16) and its Parallel in Ugaritic Literature (2 Aqht V:4-31)”, *BetM* 32 (1987) 168-177 (Hebrew).

¹⁹ A substantially different tradition is found in JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* 1.196-198.

²⁰ For further examples, cf. M. MACH, *Studies in Jewish Angelology in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Dissertation, Tel Aviv University; Tel Aviv 1986) 40 (Hebrew).

III. The identity of the angel appearing before Joshua: Uriel or Michael?

The various Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch — *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *Targum Neofiti*, *Fragmentary Targum* and the *Cairo Genizah Fragment Targum* — mention eight angels by name in 18 different verses. Most of these occurrences are in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, which names seven angels in 16 verses, even though the Hebrew Bible generally does not mention angels by name, with the exception of Michael and Gabriel²¹. In the *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua, “commander of the army of the Lord” (שר־צבא־יהוה) is translated simply as “the angel of the Lord”, with no mention by name. In this respect then, the *Targum Jonathan* translation of Prophets differs significantly from the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* translation of the Pentateuch, well known for its fondness for angels, and is closer to *Targum Onqelos*, which is cautious about expanding about angels beyond what appears in the Hebrew Bible. In contrast, in the *Cairo Genizah Fragment Targum*, the angel “Uriel/Ariel” is explicitly named as the “commander of the Lord’s army”²².

It is possible that there existed a tradition regarding the angel Uriel, later expressed in the literature of the *Zohar*, whereby he is one of the four angels surrounding God’s throne, and is also identified with the angel who wanted to kill Moses (or his infant son) on route to Egypt (cf. Exod 4,24-26). Consequently, the choice of a specific name for the angel would signify the desire of the translators to strengthen the association between the figure of Moses and that of Joshua, by creating a parallel between the rabbi and his disciple²³.

²¹ See AZUELOS, *The Angelology*, 112-113. Michael and Gabriel are mentioned by name in Dan 10,13.21; 12,1.

²² KASHER, “The Aramaic Targums”, 93, notes this mythical interpretation: mention of angels and references to the pious man characterize many of the additions of the Targum. With regard to the angel’s name, R. KASHER, *Targumic Toseftot to the Prophets* (Jerusalem 1996) 74 (Hebrew), comments that the name of the angel is “Ariel” in other versions, but he does not accept this change; cf. R. KASHER, “Angelology and the Supernatural Worlds in the Aramaic Targums to the Prophet”, *JSJ* 27 (1996) 169 n. 5.

²³ See R. MARGALIT, *Malakhei Elyon*. Those Mentioned in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds, in *All the Midrashim, Zohar and Tikkunim, Targumim and Yalkutim with Notes to the Holy Books of the Kabbalah* (Jerusalem 1964²) 8-10 (Hebrew).

Nonetheless, we suggest that it is more likely that the angel is Michael. The angel Michael is mentioned in Dan 10,21 with the title שר (“prince”), in Dan 10,13 he is described as “one of the chief princes” (אחד השרים הראשנים), and in Dan 12,1 as “the great chief” (השר הגדול). In Dan 8,11, however, we find the title “commander of the army” (שר-הצבא) ascribed to Michael, reminiscent of the mysterious figure appearing before Joshua in Josh 5,14 as “commander of the army of the Lord” (שר-צבא-יהוה). It is possible, then, that *Targum Jonathan* Josh 5,13-15 is employing a *gezerah shawah* in order to identify the angel Michael, the “commander of the army” from the Book of Daniel, with the anonymous “commander of the army of the Lord” in Josh 5,14²⁴. This might be a good indication, then, of the intended identification of מלאכא דשליח מן קדם יי (“the angel that was sent from before the Lord”) in *Targum Jonathan* with the angel Michael. To this conclusion we must also add a consideration of the figure of the angel appearing with a drawn sword in Gen 31,24, as it is translated in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*²⁵. *Targum Jonathan* identifies the “man” standing before Joshua “with a sword drawn in his hand” (וחרבו שלופה בידו, Josh 5,13) as an “angel of the Lord”, thereby continuing the targumic tradition linking the appearance of God’s angel with the drawn sword motif. Such an association is found, for example, in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, where the sentence in Gen 31,24 “then God came to Laban the Aramean in a dream by night” (ויבא אלהים אל לבן הארמי בחלם הלילה) is translated “then an angel came²⁶ by a word from before the Lord (ואתא מלאכא במימר מן קדם ה’) and drew his sword against Laban the deceiver (ושלף חרבא על לבן ארמאא) in a dream of the night”²⁷. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* of this verse is based most likely on *Pirqé de Rabbi Eliezer* 36, according to which the angel, whose name is

²⁴ On this rabbinical method, see P. BASTA, *Gezerah Shawah*. Storia, forme e metodi dell’analogia biblica (SubBib 26; Roma 2006).

²⁵ See L. GINZBERG, *The Legends of the Jews*, V (Ramat Gan 1974) 121 n. 21 (Hebrew): the angel is Michael, who is identified as the “prince of Israel” (שר ישראל).

²⁶ The Targum converts the biblical term אלהים (“God”) to מלאכא (“angel”) to preclude the possible interpretation that God revealed himself to Laban.

²⁷ For more on *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 31,24, see A. CHESTER, *Divine Revelation and Divine Titles in the Pentateuchal Targumim* (TSAJ 14; Tübingen 1986) 130-131.

given as Michael, comes down with a drawn sword in his hand in order to warn Laban.

The association between the appearance of the angel of the Lord and the motif of the “drawn sword” is not made explicit in the Hebrew text of Gen 31,24, but it is unequivocal in the story of Balaam: “The donkey saw the angel of the Lord standing in the road, with a drawn sword in his hand” (Num 22,23.31), and in the story of David: “David looked up and saw the angel of the Lord standing between earth and heaven, and in his hand a drawn sword stretched out over Jerusalem” (1 Chr 21,16a).

In Josh 5,13 we find: “He looked up and saw a man standing before him with a drawn sword in his hand”. The “angel of the Lord” who appears in the stories of Balaam and of David with his sword drawn ²⁸, then, parallels the “man” who appears before Joshua and, therefore, *Targum Jonathan* could accordingly translate “commander of the army of the Lord” as “angel of the Lord”, as is also the case in the targumic *toseftot*. We have here, then, a double *gezerah shawah* which supports our conclusion that the angel appearing before Joshua is in fact Michael ²⁹.

The tradition of the Angel Michael as Israel’s angelic champion was well established in the apocalypses of the Second Temple period ³⁰: he became the principal Angel in many circles in the first century CE ³¹. The representation of Michael as the prince of the heavenly armies was common in the early Christian tradition. The term ἀρχάγγελος appears twice in the NT: in Jude 9 and in 1 Thess 4,16. In the first text, Michael is the “Archangel” (ὁ ἀρχάγγελος),

²⁸ KASHER, *Targumic Toseftot*, 123, reports a targumic *tosefta* to 1 Kgs 1,1 (ms. Salamanca 1), which describes in detail the Angel of Death who appears before David with a drawn sword in his hand.

²⁹ In the Christian iconographic tradition, the Archangel Michael is represented with a drawn sword, slaying a serpent. This representation owes its popularity to the victory of Constantine over Licinius (represented as “the serpent” in some coins) at the battle of Adrianople (4th cent.). The battle took place not far from the *Michaelion*, a sanctuary north of Constantinople, where an image of Michael slaying a serpent was painted. Our research, however, indicates that, above all, the iconography of Michael with a drawn sword in his hand traces back to the literary texts mentioned in this article.

³⁰ Cf. D.D. HANNAH, *Michael and Christ*. Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity (WUNT 2.109; Tübingen 1999) 38.

³¹ Cf. HANNAH, *Michael and Christ*, 48.

i.e. the “Angel Prince,” who disputes with the devil over the body of Moses ³². In Rev 12,7 he is described as the commander of the heavenly armies battling Satan, “the great dragon, the primeval serpent” (cf. Rev 12,9), and his angels. Both passages belong to the apocalyptic genre, and in both Michael is the leader of God’s army, fighting for his elect against Satan.

Similarly, the angel Michael is also frequently mentioned in the Pseudepigrapha, especially in apocalyptic writings. The *Second Book of Enoch* 22,6 cites the following words by Enoch: “And the archistratege Michael lifted me up, and led me before the Lord’s face”. In this text, then, we find two analogies to our targumic text. First, Michael is called “archistratege”, i.e. “chief-captain” (also in 33,10). Second, it uses the expression “before the Lord”. In the Pseudepigrapha, the angel Michael is sometimes represented standing “before the Lord” ³³. The apocalyptic writings describe Michael as “the first of four presences that stand before God”, preceding Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel ³⁴. The targumists, however, emphasize that all the angels stand serving “before the Lord” ³⁵. It can be deduced that there exists a heavenly liturgy in which the angels do priestly service, and *vice versa* that the service of the priests in the Temple mirrors that of the angels, God’s servants *par excellence*.

The Greek term ἀρχιστράτηγος (“archistratege”) translates שַׂר צְבָא already in the *Septuaginta*, in Josh 5,14-15. It is also attributed to the angel Michael in the *Septuaginta*, in Dan 8,11. In the Pseudepigrapha as well, the title “archistratege” is similarly often assigned to Michael ³⁶. References in the *Third Book of Baruch* reveal

³² In light of this text, the tradition in *Tg. Ps.-J. Deut* 34,6, according to which Michael and his angels bury Moses, might be old.

³³ See, for instance, *TestAbrA* 7,11: “The archistratege says to him: ‘I am Michael the archistratege who stands before God’”; cf. also 9,7; 14,13.

³⁴ Cf. *1 Hen* 9,1; 40,9; *1Q19bis* 2 4. The order of the four Angels is different, and Sariel is mentioned rather than Uriel (even if Michael is always in the primary position) in *IQM* 9,15.16; *4Q285* 1 3; cf. also *4Q201* 1 IV,6.

³⁵ Cf., for example, *Tg. Neof. Exod* 33,23 (cf. also *Tg. Ps.-J., Frg. Tg.*); *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 1,26; 3,22; *Exod* 20,23 (this tradition is polemical with regard to the worship of angels); *Num* 15,40.

³⁶ Cf. *3 Bar* 11,4.6.7.8; 12,4; 13,3; *TestAbrA* 1,4; 2,1.2.3.4.6.7.10; 3,4.9.10.11; 4,5.7.9; 5,1.10.14; 6,1; 7,8.10.11; 8,1.2.4.11.12; 9,1.2.3.7.8; 10,4.5.12; 11,8; 12,15; 13,1.2; 14,1.2.3.4.5.10.12.13; 15,1.2.9.11; 16,8; 19,4; *TestAbrB* 14,7; *JosAs* 14,7.

that, in the first century CE, Michael's identification as the chief-captain of the heavenly armies was well accepted (the *Third Book of Baruch* is thought to have been written in the late first century CE, but contains earlier traditions). This is confirmed by the Dead Sea Scrolls, as, for example, in the *War Scroll*, 1QM 17,6-8: "(God) will send eternal support to the company of his redeemed by the power of the majestic angel of the authority of Michael. By eternal light He shall joyfully light up the covenant of Israel; peace and blessing for the lot of God, to exalt the authority of Michael among the gods (להרים באלים משרת מיכאל) and the dominion of Israel among all flesh". The Dead Sea Scrolls reflect also a belief in a specific principal angel, designated the "Angel of Truth", "the Prince of Light(s)", or "Melchizedek". This is probably the very same angel identified as Michael ³⁷.

In light of this background, the reasoning behind the insertion by *Targum Jonathan Josh* 5,14-15 is clear: the "commander of the Lord's army" (שר-צבא-יהוה), the "archistrategē" (LXX), is the "angel sent from before the Lord" (מלאך שליח מן קדם יי). One might ask why the targumist does not specify the identity of the angel. Perhaps this is due to the prostration and "worship" by Joshua in v. 15. The targumist follows the traditions of the Pharisees, who believed strongly in angels (in contrast to the Sadducees who insisted on "angels" of flesh and blood, or as symbolic expressions of God's actions), while avoiding the hazards of explicit angel worship, a strong temptation in the Second Temple period, especially in some circles, as attested in *Targum Neofiti* ³⁸.

Various traditions and beliefs about the angel Michael flourished both in Judaism of the Second Temple period and in early Christianity. The early Christian tradition and the Fathers of the Church shared a common interpretation of Josh 5,13-15 with the Targums: Origen ³⁹ and Aphraates ⁴⁰ also identify the "archistrategē" in Josh 5,14-15 with the angel Michael. It is probable that Origen and

³⁷ On the Archangel Michael in the Qumran literature, see HANNAH, *Michael and Christ*, 55-75.

³⁸ Cf., for example, Col 2,18.

³⁹ See Origen, *Sel. in Jos.*, PG 12.821. In *Hom. In Jos.* 6.2, however, Origen identifies the figure with Christ, as does Justin (see n. 42 below).

⁴⁰ APHRAATES, *Dem.* 3.14.

Aphraates, who often demonstrate their knowledge of Jewish traditions, borrowed this idea from an earlier Jewish interpretation ⁴¹.

In Justin, however, we find a different, distinctly christological, interpretation of the “archistrategos”: Jesus Christ himself is the ἀρχιστράτηγος ⁴². In *Dialogue with Tripho* 61, Justin identifies the mysterious figure in Josh 5,13–15 with Christ: “God begot before all creatures a Beginning, who was a certain rational power proceeding from himself, who is called by the Holy Spirit, now the Glory of the Lord, now the Son, again Wisdom, again an Angel, then God, and then Lord and Logos; and on another occasion he calls himself ‘Captain’ (ἀρχιστράτηγον), when he appeared in human form to Joshua, the son of Nave”. We find a similar interpretation in *Dialogues with Tripho* 62 as well.

IV. The description of the angel

The naming of angels is a common tradition in the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch. A *tosefta* from the *Cairo Genizah Fragment Targum* goes one step further by inserting an expansion that is found neither in the Hebrew Bible nor in *Targum Jonathan* of the Prophets, and includes a physical description of the Angel.

The *Targum Jonathan* to Josh 5,13 writes simply:

והוה כד הוה יהושע ביריחו וזקף עינוהי וחזא והא גברא קאים לקבליה.

“And it came about when Joshua was in Jericho that he lifted his eyes and saw, behold, a man was standing in front of him”.

In the *Geniza Tosefta* (Cambridge T-S B 13.12) we find the following text ⁴³:

והוה כד קריב יהושע ל[אנחא קרבא] ביריחו וזקף עינוהי וחזא [והא מלאכא דשמיה] אריאל אורכיה כמן א[רעא ועד] שמיא ופוחיה כמן מצרים ועד לירחו.

⁴¹ According to HANNAH, *Michael and Christ*, 40, “it is probable that they derived this exegesis from earlier Jewish commentators” and they share some aspects of the rabbinic exegesis in *BerR* 97:3 and *ShemR* 32:2-3 (quoted in *ibid.* 40, n. 66); cf. also A.R. MICHALAK, *Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Jewish Literature* (WUNT 2.330; Tübingen 2012) 115.

⁴² JUSTIN, *Dial.* 34; 61; 62.

⁴³ KASHER, *Targumic Toseftot*, 70-76.

“And it came about when Joshua approached [the battlefield] in Jericho, that he lifted his eyes and saw [behold, the angel of heaven] Ariel: his length was like from the e[arth to] heaven and his width like from Egypt to Jericho”.

The *Geniza Tosefta* depicts the angel as a gigantic mythical figure, stretching in length from the earth up to heaven, with shoulders as wide as the distance between Egypt and Jericho. This depiction stands in stark contrast to the Targums of the Pentateuch, where, at most, we find expressions such as *מלאכא בדמות גבר* (“an angel in the form of a man”) ⁴⁴.

Nonetheless, it is interesting that, although the *Geniza Tosefta* translation names the angel and portrays him as a colossus, it does not ascribe much importance to the angel’s role as the intermediary between man and God and, as such, diminishes his status. This is clear in the translation of Joshua’s question in v. 14: “Joshua fell on his face to the earth and worshiped, and he said to him: ‘What do you command your servant, my lord (אדני)?’”. In *Targum Jonathan*, this sentence is translated literally, indicating that אדני is taken to refer to the figure of the angel before him. The *Geniza Tosefta*, in contrast, translates: “Joshua fell on his face saying: ‘I beseech yo[u, fo]rgive now the sins of your servant for his work (עובדיה בדיל עובדיה)’, and said to h[im]: ‘A]ll that was spoken from before the Lord Most High we will accomplish it and do it’” (כ[ל] ל מרתאמר מן קדם) (יי עלינא לאשלמה ולמעבדה) ⁴⁵. Here it appears that Joshua’s words are not a question but rather an expression of subjugation to God, indicating that אדני (“my lord”) refers to God rather than to the angel. Joshua, in fact, is addressing God directly and ignoring the angel in his plea for forgiveness ⁴⁶. He concludes with the declaration: “All that was spoken from before the Lord Most High we will accomplish it and do it”. In the dialogue between Joshua and the angel of the Lord in the *Geniza Tosefta* (ms. Cambridge T-S B 13.12) to v. 14, it

⁴⁴ *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 32,25*.

⁴⁵ KASHER, *Targumic Toseftot*, also reports on the versions in ms. Paris 75: מלאך שליח מן קדם (‘the angel sent from before the Lord’); and in ms. Montefiori 192: מלאכא דשליח מן קדם (‘the angel that was sent from before the Lord’).

⁴⁶ Cf. KASHER, “Angelology”, 170.

seems that Joshua’s question to the angel (“For which of them [duties] have you come?”), (על האדן מנהון אחתא, and the angel’s reply, identifying one of the two tasks, emerge from the assumption that each angel has a single duty. Thus we understand the concluding sentence to be the words of the angel responding to Joshua’s prayer, rather than Joshua’s words. In this version, it is the angel who says: “All that was spoken from before the Lord Most High we will accomplish it and do it” (כל מדרתאמר מן קדם יי עלינא לאשלמה ולמעבדה).

The targumic translation here of “commander of the Lord’s army” (שר-צבא-יהוה) as “an angel sent from before the Lord” (מלאך שליח מן קדם יי) or “the angel that was sent from before the Lord” (מלאכא דשליח מן קדם יי) differs stylistically from the translation in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* of the Pentateuch, where the biblical term “angel” in its non-corporeal meaning is translated as מלאך or מלאכא. In cases where the angel appears adjacent to one of God’s names, it is translated as מלאכא דה’ (“the angel of the Lord”) ⁴⁷. Nonetheless, nowhere in the Aramaic Targums of the Pentateuch is there a description as expansive or unusual as the one in the “commander of the Lord’s army” scene in Joshua, where the targumists take a step beyond merely noting that he is an angel and add a definition of his role as an emissary of God ⁴⁸. This additional definition works, in fact, to preclude an interpretation of the world of angels as a hierarchy, as a place where angels have specific roles or the ability to act independently. This is why “commander of the army of the Lord” is translated simply as “angel”, without embellishments ⁴⁹, emphasizing that he is not an independent entity acting upon his own volition, but rather an emissary acting in the service of God. It is probable that this targumic elaboration is the result of the fact that the term “angel” does not appear explicitly in the Hebrew text of Joshua, although its nature becomes evident further on; therefore it is translated as “an angel sent from before the Lord” or “the angel sent from before the Lord”.

⁴⁷ See AZUELOS, *The Angelology*, 36-38.

⁴⁸ See W. SMELIK, *The Targum of Judges* (OTS 36; Leiden – New York – Köln 1955) 352-353, for a similar phenomenon in Judg 2,2.

⁴⁹ Cf. KASHER, “Angelology”, 169.

V. The angel’s mission

The primary duty of the angel-emissary is expressed through his literal transmission of God’s words to individuals and communities, and often also in his execution of a mission. Therefore, the angel must appear in combination with the requisite message from God ⁵⁰. In the “commander of the army of the Lord” scene, however, there is a certain vagueness as to the actual mission of the angel. The angel responds to Joshua’s query: “Are you one of us, or one of our adversaries?” (5,13) with the statement: “I have now come” (5,14). What does he mean? Can God’s pronouncement be found in his answer?

Unlike present day interpreters, the targumists felt the need to include the content of the conversation between the commander of the army of the Lord — the angel — and Joshua, so as to convey the nature of his mission explicitly ⁵¹. *Targum Jonathan* translates Josh 5,14: “Then he said: ‘No, but I am an angel sent from before the Lord (מלאך שליח מן קדם יי)’. Now I have come’ [*tosefta* in the marginal notes according to ms. O: ‘to be repaid by you in the evening because of the cancellation of the offerings of the Lord in this day, because of the cancellation of the teaching of the Torah’. He said to him: ‘For which one of the duties have you come?’. He said: ‘For the abolishment of the teaching of the Torah I have come (על בטול תלמוד תורה כען אחיתי)’. Then Joshua fell on his face on the ground and worshiped and said to him: ‘Whatever my lord speaks with his servant’”.

With the exception of the marginal note by ms. O, *Targum Jonathan* translates the section literally with no apparent concern for the abbreviated style. The targumic addition in the *Targum Jonathan* and the *Geniza Tosefta*, however, supply the dialogue between the angel and Joshua, thereby clarifying the mission: the angel asserts that he is there to hold Joshua to account for abolishing the sacrifice and the Torah. Joshua questions him further, wanting to know exactly what sin the angel has to come to punish him for, and is given

⁵⁰ See A. ROFÉ, *The Belief in Angels in the Bible and in Early Israel* (Jerusalem 1979) 24-26 (Hebrew).

⁵¹ Cf. Y. KAUFMANN, *The Book of Joshua* (Jerusalem 1975) 109 (Hebrew); AHITUV, *Joshua*, 109; see the bibliography in E. ASSIS, *From Moses to Joshua and from Miraculous to the Ordinary. A Literary Analysis of the Conquest Narrative in the Book of Joshua* (Jerusalem 2005) 116, n. 39 (Hebrew).

the answer: “I am here because of the abolishment of the Torah (על בטול תלמוד תורה כען אחיתי)”. It follows that the targumic additions in *Targum Jonathan* and the *Geniza Tosefta* do not associate the angel’s mission with the preparations for war, such as his instructions to Joshua for the conquest of Jericho in chapter 6. It appears that the targumists in *Targum Jonathan* and the Geniza fragment view this scene as the conclusion of a literary unit, which begins in Josh 1,8 with the commandment to study the Torah (“This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth; you shall meditate on it day and night, so that you may be careful to act in accordance with all that is written in it. For then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall be successful”) ⁵² and ends with the admonishment by the commander of the army of the Lord about the duty to study Torah.

The scene where the commander of the army of the Lord admonishes Joshua for abandoning the Torah was placed before the stories of conquest to emphasize the message to Joshua: he would not succeed in conquering the land without the Torah. Here lies an important message to the assembly listening to the targumic translation in synagogues, where the Targum was part of the liturgical rite. It is all the more effective considering that Josh 5,2 – 6,1 was read as the *haftarah* of the first day of Passover ⁵³. This targumic addition also has the effect of portraying Joshua more as a scholar dedicated to following the commandment to study the Torah than as the heroic conqueror of the land ⁵⁴. The portrayal of Joshua in the targumic additions agrees with his description in the Sages who interpret Josh 8,9 (“Joshua spent that night in the camp”) and Josh 8,13 (Joshua spent that night in the valley) as follows: “This teaches that he spent the night in the depth of the *halakhah*” (מלמד שלן בעומקה של הלכה) ⁵⁵.

⁵² For details of the scholarly debate about the role of the literary unit at hand, cf. ASSIS, *From Moses to Joshua*, 116 n. 37.

⁵³ According to KASHER, “The Aramaic Targums”, 89, who sees the source of the Targum in the educational contexts of the *bet midrash* and school, this *tosefta* is also important for its message to the disciples and students of the Torah.

⁵⁴ Cf. Th. RÖMER, “Josué, lecteur de la Tora (Jos 1,8)”, “*Lasset uns Brücken bauen ...*”. Collected Communications to the XVth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament. Cambridge 1995 (eds. K.-D. SCHUNCK – M. AUGUSTIN) (BEAT 42; Frankfurt am Main 1998) 117-124. On the transformations in the depiction of the figure of Joshua in the Bible, cf. ROFÉ, “Joshua”, 333-364.

⁵⁵ Cf. *b.San* 41a; *b.Er* 63b; *b.Meg* 3a. See ROFÉ, “Joshua”, 341.

In this sense, *Targum Jonathan* reinforces the ideal of the “wise scholar” (חלמיד חכם) who spends his nights and days studying the Torah ⁵⁶.

In conclusion, it may be argued that angelological representation in the *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua is rather meager considering both the scant mention of angels in the Hebrew biblical text and the fact that the targumists did not insert additional angels when they were not mentioned in the Hebrew original. Yet, despite this paucity, much can be learned about the translation of *Targum Jonathan* of Prophets from the rather impressive angelological portrayal in the “commander of the army of the Lord” scene. The above analysis of this scene reveals an affinity between the translation of *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua and that of *Targum Onqelos* of the Pentateuch. This affinity is apparent in the literal translation method used by *Targum Jonathan*, and in its refraining from naming the angel or adding a physical description, especially in contrast to the extensive targumic additions (*tosafot*) ⁵⁷. The targumic *tosafot* are more reminiscent in the style of the Palestinian Targums of the Pentateuch, which expand and add much detail to the Hebrew Bible version.

Multi-Disciplinary Studies

Yaacov AZUELOS

The Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Israel

Studium Theologicum Galilaeae
Korazym, Israel

Francesco Giosuè VOLTAGGIO

SUMMARY

The aim of this essay is to analyze the angelologic world of the *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua. The “angels” in Josh 6,25 and 7,22 are considered in the Targum as “messengers” of flesh and blood. Although “angels” as non-corporeal emissaries of God do not appear explicitly in Joshua, “the commander of the Lord’s army” in 5,15 is interpreted by the targumists as “an angel sent from before the Lord”. After presenting his description in the Targum, we discuss his identity and mission. On the basis of biblical, pseudepigraphal and targumic sources, we claim that the angel is Michael.

⁵⁶ Cf. ROFÉ, “Joshua”, 343.

⁵⁷ See KASHER, “The Aramaic Targums”, 89.

A King Like The Nations: 1 Samuel 8 in Its Cultural Context

Commentators on 1 Samuel are inclined to speculate broadly on which properties of “the nations” the elders of Israel expect to derive from the institution of kingship. The illocution of the elders’ request is nuanced accordingly, depending on the expected interpretation. The most popular variations include:

- (1) “Give us a king [instead of a judge] like the other nations [so our state can function like theirs do]”. This interpretation is a rejection of the institution of judgeship ¹.
- (2) “Give us a king [instead of a deity] like the other nations [have]”. This interpretation is a rejection of YHWH personally ².
- (3) “Give us a king [so we may become] like the other nations [because they are better off than us]”. This interpretation is a request for a new national identity ³.

What these commentators continuously fail to explore is how, exactly, the “other nations” perceived their identity, their monarchy, and most importantly, their relationship with their gods. It is necessarily true that whatever Israel is “rejecting” must be something that orthodox Israel possesses that the nations do not.

I would instead prefer an interpretation as follows: “Give us a king [who is] like [the kind that] the other nations [have, who will serve the same functions in the same manner as theirs]”. This interpretation sees a new dynamic in the way that Israel as a nation, via its leader, relates to its God. Specifically, it reflects a theology reminiscent of the ancient Near Eastern nations they wish to emulate. By asking for a king “like the nations”, they reflect their desire for a God “like the nations”; implicitly, instead of the God they have. It is this rejection of YHWH’s identity that causes him to say, “they have rejected me”.

¹ See R.D. BERGEN, *1, 2 Samuel*. An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture (NAC; Nashville, TN 1996) 113.

² See L.M. ESLINGER, *Kingship of God in Crisis*. A Close Reading of 1 Samuel 1–12 (Sheffield 1985) 263.

³ See D. TSUMURA, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 249.

I. A Note on Methodology

This article undertakes a synchronic reading of 1 Samuel 8 and the portion of the larger “ark narrative” preserved in ch. 4. First Samuel 8 is admittedly a complex document, and the copious amounts of ink spilled on the subject have failed to yield a consensus as to the history of its redaction or its place in the larger context of the Deuteronomistic History⁴. The present analysis will be directed toward offering a coherent interpretation of the final redacted form of the Deuteronomistic History under the working hypothesis that Israel’s stated motivations for wanting a king, the literary context of their request in relationship to the preceding ark narratives, and the response of YHWH need not reflect diverse and incompatible elements. Text critical issues and the complications of redaction and sources in the composition of the book need not impede such a study⁵.

⁴ R.W. KLEIN, *1 Samuel* (WBC; Waco, TX 1983) 73-74; H.W. HERTZBERG, *I & II Samuel. A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1976) 74; A. CAQUOT – P. DE ROBERT, *Les livres de Samuel* (CAT 6; Genève 1994) 113-118; G.E. GERBRANDT, *Kingship according to the Deuteronomistic History* (SBLDS 87; Atlanta, GA 1986) 140-150 (esp. 141-142); W. DIETRICH, *Samuel 1: 1 Samuel 1-12* (BKAT 8.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010) 349-352; R. E. CLEMENTS, “The Deuteronomistic Interpretation of the Founding of the Monarchy in I Sam. VIII”, *VT* 24.4 (1974) 398-410.

⁵ A diachronic reading will not resolve the interpretive issue addressed in this article, which focuses on the phrases “Give us a king like the nations” (5b) and “they have rejected me” (7), which are thought to belong to the same level of redaction (CAQUOT – DE ROBERT, *Les livres de Samuel*, 114; see also DIETRICH, *Samuel 1*, 352; R.G. KRATZ, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* [trans. J. BOWDEN] [London 2005] 184). The reference to Samuel’s sons in v. 3, which ties to ch. 4 and the Elides, is attributed to this same source, as is the recapitulation of 5b in v. 20 (DIETRICH, *Samuel 1*, 352; KRATZ, *Composition*, 184). Commentators have shown no inclination to attribute the addition of “to fight our battles” to a different source. The ark narrative is, of course, a different source, but its provenance (though certainly not later than the exilic redaction proposed by Dietrich et al.) and date of incorporation into the larger Deuteronomistic History are unknown. Klein observes, “the ark narrative may have been written in the tenth century [...] but its present function is to be understood within the structure set up by the deuteronomistic historian”. KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 40; see also KRATZ, *Composition*, 182. Specifically for our purposes, 4,3-11 are considered to be a single unit. See A.F. CAMPBELL, *The Ark Narrative* (SBLDS 16; Atlanta, GA 1975) 56-57.

The reference to “the nations” necessitates a comparative study. I do not propose that the redactor (or any of his/their sources, for that matter) had any particular documents in mind; rather, they are drawing on what Walton has called the “cognitive environment”⁶. Ideas about the nature of kingship are relatively consistent throughout the ancient Near East; the neo-Assyrian documents referenced in this article are intended to stand as examples of the kind of thinking that permeated the culture at the time of the redaction of the Deuteronomistic History.

II. Kings versus Judges

Options need to be compared with alternatives. We know the elders want a king, and we know (superficially) why. We have to guess what they want a king instead of. This in turn will reveal their true motives and the source of YHWH’s ire. The desire for monarchy is usually contrasted with an imagined ideal and seen as a decision to make their lives worse: the king’s despotism (vv. 11-18) is preferred over the unstated beneficence of a hypothetical, alternative power structure. Occasionally the ideal is imagined to exist in the minds of the elders, as suggested by Auld⁷ (the elders are seeking an escape from the cycle of foreign oppression that judgeship has consistently failed to provide), but more often the ideal is fabricated by the interpreter, sometimes on the basis of something “implicit in the Torah”⁸ and sometimes on the basis of anachronistic Western political ideology, with emphasis on things like freedom and liberty and disdain for monarchy as an institution⁹. The idea of YHWH re-

⁶ J.H. WALTON, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI 2006) 21.

⁷ A.G. AULD, *1 & 2 Samuel* (OTL; Louisville, KY 2011) 93. See also ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 255.

⁸ BERGEN, *Samuel*, 113. This assertion is based on the assumption that divine and human monarchies are mutually exclusive. See “Kings versus Deity” below.

⁹ For example: “Each family had been autonomous, under the leadership of its elders. It had been beholden to no one, whereas under a king military and agricultural conscription would restrict Israel’s liberty [...]. Taxation, which had been unknown, would become increasingly oppressive, until the people were virtually slaves, and cried out for liberation. But having made a

luctantly (or vindictively) replacing his original sociopolitical ideal of [blank] with the poorly-considered request for “monarchy” and simply making do for the rest of the Bible is a common theme among commentators. From Bergen: “In a move that would determine the shape of Israel’s history from that day forward [...] the Lord acceded to their will. A troubling future for Israel was thus assured”¹⁰. Polzin agrees: “Because of the ideological clarity of chapter 8, the reader is allowed no doubt about the intrinsic evil of kingship”¹¹. McCarter compares the transition from judgeship to monarchy to the expulsion from paradise in Genesis 3, and cites 1 Samuel 7 as the depiction of the alternative ideal¹². More nuanced but still speculative is Gordon: “In explanation of why the monarchy failed despite being under divine auspices [...] the institution came not as a gift, but as a concession from Yahweh”¹³. In context, this “failure” means “failure to prevent idolatry” despite the fact that the text explicitly describes this failure as a well-established trend under all of the previous “theocratic” regimes (v. 8), and, while it is true that idolatry is common among the kings, we will note that Saul, the exemplar of monarchical failure, is not an idolator¹⁴. Gordon emphasizes that even the request for monarchy is an example of this failure¹⁵, but if the failure is the fault of the governing institution, is judgeship not just as fallible as monarchy? Or, *modus tollens*, if the failure is not due to the judge, as YHWH assures Samuel it is not (v. 7, also 12,4), nor to the institution of judgeship (the “theocratic ideal” that the elders supposedly reject), how can failure under monarchy be considered the fault of the monarchy¹⁶?

deliberate choice of this form of government, Israel would have to live with its restricting demands”. BALDWIN, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 84.

¹⁰ BERGEN, *Samuel*, 116.

¹¹ R. POLZIN, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist* (San Francisco, CA 1989) 88.

¹² P.K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel* (AB; Garden City, NY 1980) 160-161. See also HERTZBERG, *Samuel*, 72.

¹³ R.P. GORDON, *1 & 2 Samuel: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI 1986) 110.

¹⁴ D.M. GUNN, *The Fate of King Saul* (JSOTSS 14; Sheffield 1980) 38.

¹⁵ See GORDON, *Samuel*, 110: “The people of Israel are chafing at God’s exercise of his sovereign rights over them just as they have been inclined to do since the time of the Exodus”.

¹⁶ See KLEIN, *1 Samuel*, 74. “Later prophetic critique against social inequalities does not blame the king for them”.

Too many texts speak neutrally or positively of kingship to warrant writing off the entire institution. The most blatant institutional criticism the Deuteronomist has to offer — “In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes” (Judg 17,6; 18,1; 19,1; 21,25) — actually offers monarchy as the antidote¹⁷. But even the books of Samuel themselves speak positively of monarchy. Firth elaborates: “It seems clear from the finished book that Yahweh did not absolutely oppose that kingship, and would later enter into a covenant relationship with David centered on kingship [...]. 2,10 and 2,34-35 indicate that Yahweh was moving towards monarchy. We have to reckon with the narrator’s intention in the finished text”¹⁸. Firth departs from other commentators by seeing the ideal rejected by the elders as also a monarchy, but a monarchy initiated by God rather than the people: “Samuel’s speech about the justice of the king is not therefore a description of what monarchy was meant to be in Israel, but rather what it would be if the elders achieved their intention”¹⁹. Klein concurs: “Kingship was Yahweh’s gift to a highly undeserving Israel; it provided additional evidence of his covenant fidelity”²⁰. Likewise Evans: “[kingship] was a gift from God, a model and a channel through which God’s relationship with Israel could be illustrated and strengthened”²¹.

Some commentators try to further classify the passage’s seemingly negative tone as a case of presentation rather than affirmation. Polzin suggests that the distaste for the institution comes from Samuel, not the narrator, who in fact is using the account to criticize the actions of a petulant judge: “Samuel is depicted by the narrator [...] as [attempting] to delay, if not also to subvert, the Lord’s decision [...]. His rhetoric is an attempt to block the institution itself”²². This opinion is echoed by Eslinger²³, but it is difficult to reconcile with v. 10’s

¹⁷ See also BALDWIN, *Samuel*, 83.

¹⁸ D.G. FIRTH, *1 & 2 Samuel* (Downers Grove, IL 2009) 111.

¹⁹ FIRTH, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 116. See also D. LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety and Politics. The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia* (Grand Rapids, MI 2003) 315.

²⁰ KLEIN, *Samuel*, 79.

²¹ M. EVANS, *1 and 2 Samuel* (NIBC; Peabody, MA 2000) 42.

²² POLZIN, *Samuel*, 86.

²³ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 216.

assertion that Samuel speaks “all the words of the Lord”²⁴. Even so, a synchronic reading of the Deuteronomistic History makes it difficult to find any fault inherent in the institution of monarchy. We must look elsewhere for the source of YHWH’s displeasure.

III. Kings versus Deity

Some commentators, rather than focusing on the implications of “king”, instead focus on YHWH’s statement in v. 7: “They have rejected me as king over them”. In their assessment, it is not Samuel and the institution of judgeship that is abandoned but rather YHWH and the institution of theocracy, which are to be replaced with a leader who is incidentally a monarch but emphatically a human. This interpretation assumes that divine and human kingship are mutually exclusive; so Firth: “Yahweh’s authority is usurped and put into the hands of a king”²⁵. Gunn also assumes a zero-sum relationship between divine and human leaders: “[Yahweh] alone is ‘king’ of Israel and to him the people’s desire for an earthly king is a denigration of his own kingship”²⁶. Tsumura emphasizes the shift away from theocracy: “The fact that the Israelites had been content with the institution of judgeship shows that they admitted that God ruled over them as a king. Now the people reject this fact of theocracy and demand a human king”²⁷. Eslinger adds, “The request of Yahweh’s people to become like the nations in political structure is, therefore, not only a rejection of the theocracy and its judges, but even more it is a rejection of the covenant. [...] Israel will end the relationship less painfully by simply installing a king in a secular government”²⁸. He then states the thesis as bluntly as possible: “The inauguration of a monarchy signified a practicing atheism”²⁹.

²⁴ So J.P. FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel* (Assen 1993) V.4, 346.

²⁵ FIRTH, *1 & 2 Samuel*, 114. See also BERGEN, *Samuel*, 113.

²⁶ GUNN, *Saul*, 59.

²⁷ TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 250.

²⁸ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 257-8. See also A. WÉNIN, *Samuel et l’instauration de la monarchie (1 S 1-12)*. Une recherche littéraire sur le personnage (Europäische Hochschulschriften 23, Theologie 342; Frankfurt a. M. 1988) 145.

²⁹ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 263, cf. LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 308.

This interpretation might be possible, except that the request has a specific context: the elders want a king like the nations. While “secular” government is normative in the modern world, it is unknown to ancient Israel and her neighbors; all of the “nations” are fully theocratic: “These ancient cultures did not locate the source of sovereignty in the earthly sphere (e.g., in the will of the people, in the state, or any other abstract entity) but rather the heavenly one”³⁰. This is also true in Assyria: “The notion is that of the king as the steward of the gods, especially of the principal national god and eponym of the state [...]. Aššur remains the real and ultimate king”³¹. Several Assyrian coronation rituals explicitly announce that “Aššur is king”³². Kings do not usurp the power of the gods and replace them or even reign with them as equals; they receive power from the gods and serve them as vassals. “In the ancient world the king stood between the divine and human realms mediating the power of the deity in his city and beyond. [...] The concept of divine sponsorship is the most important element in the ideology of kingship”³³. None of the surrounding nations would ever want to do away with their gods, and neither does Israel.

A slightly different reading to the same effect emphasizes YHWH’s reference to “forsaking me and serving other gods” in v. 8 and concludes that the sin of the elders must be idolatry³⁴. Since idolatry in general means replacing YHWH with [object], usually another god, this case of idolatry means replacing YHWH with [object] which is a king³⁵. This interpretation is better, especially when read together with the admonitions against idolatry in 1 Sam 7,3 and 12,21, but it still does not properly accord with the ideology of the “nations”. While kings are in some sense seen as divine, they are still “not so fully a god as the other members of the pantheon were”³⁶. They were venerated by their subjects, but they in turn

³⁰ LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 56.

³¹ P. MACHINIST, “Kingship and Divinity in Imperial Assyria”, *Text, Artifact, and Image* (eds. G.M. BECKMAN - T.J. LEWIS) (BJS 346; Providence, RI 2006) 157.

³² MACHINIST, “Kingship and Divinity”, 158-159.

³³ WALTON, *Thought*, 278-282.

³⁴ See KLEIN, *Samuel*, 79.

³⁵ See ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 266.

³⁶ MACHINIST, “Kingship and Divinity”, 186.

venerated the gods: "Viewed from heaven, the king is the principal divine emissary to his earthly community; viewed from earth [...] he is the principal emissary of his community before the pantheon"³⁷. Or, said another way: "The Assyrian king may have divine qualities, but he is not the embodiment of Aššur or Šamaš on earth, nor does he mirror a god on earth"³⁸. While a king divinized in this manner might well violate the covenant at some level (though maybe not: one of the metaphors for divine kingship is adoption into divine sonship³⁹, a status also extended to the Davidic line in 2 Sam 7,14), in no way does it constitute a replacement of the deity. Kings of the nations were part of the divine realm, perhaps, but they were not gods and were not worshipped as gods. Having a king like the nations would not have constituted an expansion of the pantheon, and thus cannot be considered *de facto* idolatry.

The argument that human kingship and divine kingship are mutually exclusive is usually supported by appealing to Judg 8,23⁴⁰. Tsumura draws a distinction between the type of ruler the elders ask for (*melek*) and the type God chooses to grant them (*nāgîd*), with the distinction involving power dynamics: "The ruler is called *ngyd* when his bond or subordination to God is preeminent, *mlk* when the origin of his position and base of his power lie in the people"⁴¹. (Though compare Launderville, "The sovereign was king of the gods and the earthly king was his representative. As such the earthly king received his sovereignty from the heavenly realm and not from the people"⁴².) In this more nuanced version, the divine realm is still acknowledged; there is no secularism or atheism, but the mediator is granted greater autonomy. This shift actually is re-

³⁷ MACHINIST, "Kingship and Divinity", 186.

³⁸ Z. BAHRANI, *The Graven Image*. Representation in Babylonia and Assyria (Philadelphia, PA 2003) 142.

³⁹ WALTON, *Thought*, 283. We may also note that Israel regularly acknowledges creatures native to the divine realm other than YHWH (angels, cherubim, the divine council, etc.); it simply refrains from worshipping them.

⁴⁰ So GERBRANDT, *Kingship*, 150; See also BALDWIN, *Samuel*, 83; GORDON, *Samuel*, 109; KLEIN, *Samuel*, 75; TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 243.

⁴¹ TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 249. See also M. TSEVAT, "The Biblical Account of the Foundation of the Monarchy in Israel", *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies*. Essays on the Literature and Religion of the Hebrew Bible (New York 1980) 93.

⁴² LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 291.

flected somewhat in the ideology of the nations. A dissertation by Kyle R. Greenwood describes the transition of titles in contemporary Assyria from *iššakkû* (regent), to *šarru*, the epithet preferred by later Assyrian kings, and concludes: “Finally, this shift [...] is evidence of a royal theological paradigm shift — that the human ruler of the city Aššur had replaced the god Aššur as the king of Aššur”⁴³. Something in the cognitive environment — in Assyria’s case, the rise to prominence on the international stage⁴⁴ — is prompting a shift in emphasis away from divine lordship. This in turn is supposed to reflect the arrangement Israel desires for itself: “the transformation from *iššakku* to *šarru* required a simultaneous shift in theology. No longer was Aššur king. He maintained his prominence as the state deity, but [...] his role is that of advisor and empowerer, but not ruler”⁴⁵.

This is almost true, but the problem requires more nuance, it cannot be simply reduced to “ruler (*iššakkû/ngyd*) good, king (*šarru/mlk*) bad”. For one thing, the king is utterly dependent on the advice and empowerment of the gods, which means he is under as much compulsion to serve the gods as the gods are to serve him; if that is enough to disqualify one as a ruler, the king does not really “rule” either, since he is codependent on both the gods and the people in a symbiotic communal relationship: “Human power was enhanced by divine power [...]. When a king acknowledged the divine source of his royal authority, he increased his sense of the stability of his rule, which in turn allowed him more room for experimentation”⁴⁶. Power is not zero-sum, but symbiotic. In order to attain more power, the king does not mind the gods less; he minds them more. If he does whatever he wants, his reign suffers: “A tyrannical or inept king can be propped up for only so long before he is overthrown”⁴⁷. Similarly, “If a king attempted to exercise sovereign

⁴³ K.R. GREENWOOD, *Then Aššur Will Hear His Prayers*. A Study of Middle Assyrian Royal Theology (Doctoral dissertation, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; Cincinnati, OH 2008) 37.

⁴⁴ GREENWOOD, *Then Aššur Will Hear His Prayers*, 35: “It became appropriate and necessary for Assyria’s rulers to accept titles that reflected international prestige”.

⁴⁵ GREENWOOD, *Then Aššur Will Hear His Prayers*, 107.

⁴⁶ LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 51.

⁴⁷ LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 48. The gods get to oversee this as well: “Such drastic action within communities where kings were divinely elected would

rule without attention to its divine source, his actions usually gave rise to conflicts and contradictions within a community that diminished its vitality and even led to its fragmentation”⁴⁸. The king and gods may be dependent on each other, but the gods are the stronger of the parties; the king is expendable (he is replaced at least once a generation, inevitably), but the gods remain. It may be true that the gods do not technically “rule” in the sense of having absolute authority to do anything they want exactly as they please with no consequences, but the king does not “rule” in this way either, and so it is not accurate to say that the king has “replaced” the god. “A significant check against a king’s arbitrary exercise of power was the reality of God or the gods as actors in the political affairs of the kingdom”⁴⁹. It is true that YHWH does rule in the absolute sense, and the elders, as we will see, want to change that, but in no real sense does this amount to “replacing” deity with a human king.

Second, as discussed above, the Deuteronomistic History as a whole speaks too positively of kingship to locate the problem inherently in the word. The king in Deuteronomy 17 is *melek*; the king that Israel does not have in Judges is *melek*; David who receives the royal covenant is *melek*. Israel is allowed to maintain the accidents of ancient Near Eastern cultic practice, even while overwriting their theology. “The nations” offer sacrifices to feed their gods; Israel also offers sacrifices, even though God does not need to be fed. “The nations” have temples to house their gods; Israel also has a temple, even though God does not need a house (and makes a point to say so, 2 Sam 7,6-7). “The nations”, if Greenwood is correct, have kings to rule in place of their gods; Israel also has a king [...] even though God still rules over him. The object does not dictate the theology. It is not possible for a synchronic reader of the Deuteronomistic History to locate the problem in the title *melek*, the problem must lie somewhere else.

probably have required an oracle permitting regicide” (271-272). Likewise, “The voices of previous generations and of the gods constituted a check upon the desires of the king” (284).

⁴⁸ LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 289.

⁴⁹ LAUNDERVILLE, *Piety*, 315.

IV. Basis of Israelite Identity

A third, more culturally-aware interpretation suggests that the emphasis falls on “like the nations”. In this view Israel just wants to be like everyone else, whatever that entails. Once again the monarch is incidental; if the nations had been constitutional republics the elders would have asked for that. As Tsumura explains: “The people wanted to become like all the other nations, but God had called them uniquely to be his people [...]. What they hoped to do was exactly to throw away their special status as the chosen people of God in order to identify themselves with the nations of the world”⁵⁰. Eslinger says much the same: “The elders express a desire to depart from the special political status of a nation chosen and ruled by God in order to become simply one among many ordinary nations”⁵¹. Bergen agrees: “Israel was to be fundamentally different from the other nations; the Lord was to be their king, with the nation set apart for service to the divine monarch”⁵². Finally, Hertzberg minces no words in identifying the “heathen element” in the request⁵³.

This interpretation has fundamentally the same problem as the first one, in that it requires monarchy to be unqualifiedly bad, on a theological level rather than a sociopolitical level, but bad nonetheless. As discussed above, this is virtually impossible to reconcile with later developments, particularly the Davidic covenant. Secondly, it locates Israel’s “unique identity” partially if not entirely in its political structure. It is worth noting, however, that nowhere in the Pentateuch, the document wherein Israel’s covenant identity is established, is there any mention of YHWH being their king (*melek*)⁵⁴, or a command not to have a king. Instead we see instructions for how the king should be chosen and how he should behave (Deut 17,14-20) and inclusion of the king in the covenant curses

⁵⁰ TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 249

⁵¹ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 257; see also HERTZBERG, *Samuel*, 72.

⁵² BERGEN, *Samuel*, 113.

⁵³ HERTZBERG, *Samuel*, 72.

⁵⁴ That some Israelites may have in fact considered YHWH to be their king is evidenced in a small number of personal names — Abimelech in Judg 8,31, Ahimelech in 1 Sam 21,2, Malkishua in 1 Sam 14,49, and Malkiel in Num 26,45 — but this hardly qualifies as establishment of a core national identity. See TSEVAT, “Monarchy,” 81.

(Deut 28,36). As Klein rightly observes, “[Deuteronomy 17] also refers to a ‘king like the nations’ but it is difficult to tell whether this expression [1 Sam 8,5] expresses a negative evaluation or whether it merely takes cognizance of the fact that kingship was a relatively late institution in Israel”⁵⁵. The term used by Gideon in Judg 8,23 (*māšal*) appears nowhere in the Pentateuch in reference to God either. If the structure of government is so critical, should there not be more information about it? The case would be stronger if the desire to be “like the nations” was presented along with a diverse list, or even no list at all; instead, they only ask for a single item (a king) to do a very specific thing (judge/rule us and fight our wars). Thus, it is unclear from the context whether the comparison with the nations refers to the kind of nation they want to be, or to the kind of autarch they want to have.

All of this is of course circumstantial; the strongest evidence that this interpretation is flawed comes from the manner in which the elders make their request. Commentators disagree on whether the request is well warranted due to the political needs of the time and/or the impending failure of Samuel’s sons⁵⁶, or whether it is inappropriate given the demonstrated success of the judgeship model in ch. 7⁵⁷. What is undisputed, however, is that the elders come and present their request to Samuel, YHWH’s judge, priest, and prophet. If they really desired to be free of their judge and free of their God, why would they bother to ask their judge for permission from their God? If a new judge-free government is what they want, they can simply ignore Samuel and nominate a warlord, like

⁵⁵ KLEIN, *Samuel*, 75.

⁵⁶ So FIRTH, *Samuel*, 113; AULD, *Samuel*, 93; DIETRICH, *Samuel 1*, 357; BERGEN, *Samuel*, 112; KLEIN, *Samuel*, 79; ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 255. Stoebe partially agrees, but he notes that the circumstance would only warrant a different judge, not necessarily a king: “Das Versagen der Söhne könnte streng genommen nur den Wunsch nach einem neuen Richter, nicht nach einem König begründen” (H.J. STOEBE, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* [KAT VIII.1; Gütersloh 1973] 182).

⁵⁷ So TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 248; GORDON, *Samuel*, 110; MCCARTER, *Samuel*, 160 (“the pre-monarchical institutions are presented in this material as adequate, even ideal”). Weiser presents a sort of middle ground: the judgeship under Samuel was ideal, but is now doomed to failure because of Samuel’s sons; see A. WEISER, *Samuel, seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und religiöse Bedeutung* (FRLANT; Göttingen 1962) 30.

they do with Abimelek (Judg 9,1-6) or Absalom (2 Sam 15,10-12), with no official sanction required. If a new God is what they want, they can simply start worshipping one, which they spend most of their history doing anyway. Further, when it is clear that what they want is to opt out of the Covenant, as in Numbers 14, they do not ask Moses to appoint for them a new leader; instead they decide to kill Moses and Aaron (v. 10) and choose a leader themselves (v. 4). Despite Eslinger's theory to the contrary⁵⁸, the respect the elders demonstrate toward the system is a clear indicator that they wish for the system, along with their covenant identity, to remain more or less intact.

V. Conclusions from Review of the Literature

None of these proposed interpretations is sufficient to explain what exactly is wrong with the elders' request. The monarchy as an institution is too well regarded elsewhere in the Deuteronomistic History, including the books of Samuel, to allow the reader of the final redacted form to see it as inherently evil, either sociopolitically or theologically. The desire to imitate the nations cannot indicate a break from theocracy since the nations are also theocratic, and it cannot indicate a desire to break from the covenant and its institutions since they seek legitimacy in accordance with those institutions, i.e. they ask Samuel. We must therefore examine other factors to determine the manner in which a request for a monarch constitutes rejection of YHWH.

VI. To Fight Our Battles

We will begin our investigation by examining what the elders want the king to do. Most commentators focus on vv. 5 and 20 ("judge us") or v. 9 ("rule over them")⁵⁹, and from this they conclude that the king is supposed to replace the judge or the deity (who currently rules) or both; as we have seen, these arguments are not tenable. Samuel's emphasis on "judge us" in v. 6 sheds no light on the issue either, as commentators are divided as to whether the narrator

⁵⁸ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 255.

⁵⁹ See TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 249.

shares/endorsees Samuel's sentiment or simply reports Samuel's reaction, and indeed whether that reaction is motivated by offense on behalf of YHWH⁶⁰, offense on behalf of his person (implied by God's assurance in v. 7), or offense on ideological grounds⁶¹, or perhaps less laudable reasons⁶². We are investigating YHWH's displeasure, not Samuel's, and it is not clear that their respective reasons are the same. We will therefore examine the other objective offered in v. 20: "to go out before us and fight our battles".

Commentators normally interpret the desire for a military leader as a variant of the "secularism" theme discussed above. Gerbrandt summarizes: "Israel's request for a king was a rejection of Yahweh in his role as Israel's defender [...]. The deuteronomist affirms kingship, but warns that kingship in Israel cannot be allowed to replace Yahweh in this crucial area"⁶³. Klein agrees: "The rejection includes Yahweh's leadership in war [...] the people [want] the king to lead in war; he will fight *our* — not Yahweh's — wars"⁶⁴. Likewise Eslinger, "The people prefer [...] a human king and their own devices to fight their wars. [...] Israel's request for a king is a decision on a national level to take its fate into its own hands"⁶⁵.

The problem here, as in the previous "secularism" interpretation, is that this does not reflect the ideology of the nations. In the ancient Near East, the place where you most want your deity to be present in full power is on the battlefield. An Assyrian hymn depicts the gods riding before the king into battle:

Assur went first,
 the conflagration of defeat burst out upon the enemy,
 Enlil was whirling (?) in the midst of the foe,
 fanning the blaze,
 Anu set a pitiless mace to the opponent,
 Sin, the luminary, laid upon them the tension of battle.

⁶⁰ See for example TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 250.

⁶¹ See for example DIETRICH, *Samuel I*, 374-375.

⁶² POLZIN, *Samuel*, 83.

⁶³ GERBRANDT, *Kingship*, 149.

⁶⁴ KLEIN, *Samuel*, 78; see also TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 261. Emphasis original.

⁶⁵ ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 280. Emphasis original. See also H. J. BOECKER, *Die Beurteilung der Anfänge des Königtums in den deuteronomistischen Abschnitten des I. Sammelbuches*. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des "Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks" (WMANT; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 34.

Adad, the hero, made wind and flood
 pour down over their fighting,
 Shamash, lord of judgment, blinded the eyesight
 of the army of Sumer and Akkad,
 Valiant Ninurta, vanguard of the gods, smashed their weapons,
 Ishtar flailed her jump rope, driving their warriors berserk!
 Behind the gods, his allies,
 the king at the head of the army sets to battle ⁶⁶.

This “divine vanguard motif” is also found in the Bible, most notably for our purposes in 1 Sam 7,10, where YHWH “thunders against the Philistines” as Samuel leads Israel into battle. But ch. 7 is not the first time the Israelites have taken divine assistance into battle against the Philistines. All commentators note a similarity between the sons of Samuel and the sons of Eli who fail to lead Israel to victory in ch. 4. But there are several other contextual parallels between ch. 4 and ch. 8:

| Element | Chapter 4 | Chapter 8 |
|--|--|--|
| Wicked sons establish context | Hophni and Phinehas (vv. 4, 11) | Joel and Abijah (vv. 2-3) |
| Elders make a request | “Let us bring the ark of the Lord’s covenant from Shiloh” (v. 3) | “appoint a king to lead us” (v. 5) |
| Purpose of item requested is to lead in battle | “so [YHWH] may go with us and save us from the hands of our enemies.” (v. 3) | “go out before us and fight our battles” (v. 20) |
| Resulting in divine displeasure | Ark captured (v. 11) | “They have rejected me.” (v. 7) |

If chapter 8 is indeed recapitulating chapter 4, the nature of Israel’s request becomes perfectly clear. Eslinger, Klein, *et al.* are precisely correct in saying that the elders want to fight their wars, not YHWH’s, but there is an additional important nuance. Just as in ch. 4,

⁶⁶ *Tukulti-Ninurta Epic* v. 33’-41’; translation in B. FOSTER, *Before the Muses* (Bethesda, MD ³2005) 313.

they do not want YHWH to stay home. They want YHWH to come with them to fight their wars. The king is not a replacement for the judge, or judgeship, or deity. The king is a replacement for the ark.

VII. The Role of the Ark

Broadly, two explanations are offered for the loss of the ark in 1 Samuel 4. The first is that it is taken away as punishment for covenant negligence, especially on the part of the Elides ⁶⁷. The second is that it is lost as a consequence of its misuse. While these are not mutually exclusive, the second interpretation is more important for our purposes since it allows us to take into account the motives of the elders. In partial defense of this preference, we will note that the text does not indicate that YHWH enticed the elders to send for the ark so that it would be lost in battle; cf. 1 Kgs 22,20; 2 Sam 24,1; Exod 7,3. This is at least circumstantial evidence for a more immediate cause.

If the king is indeed a replacement for the ark, we can examine the account in ch. 4 to determine how the Israelites expect it to function, and in what way that expectation provoked YHWH to abandon them. Even as early as von Rad ⁶⁸, the ark was interpreted to represent a battle palladium, an artifact that signifies the presence of deity accompanying the army ⁶⁹. This conception in itself is not theologically problematic; the ark is used this way in Joshua 6 with no negative consequences. However, the elders do not want it to serve merely as a symbol, but as a tether to drag YHWH into battle: "Israel believed that the ark's presence guaranteed victory [...]. V. 3 presumes that the ark will save the people because of the presumed control this brings over Yahweh, compelling his action" ⁷⁰.

⁶⁷ So P.D. MILLER – J.J.M. ROBERTS, *The Hand of the Lord* (Baltimore, MD 1977) 33, 70; see also ESLINGER, *Kingship*, 166-173; MCCARTER, *Samuel*, 109; KLEIN, *Samuel*, 39; BALDWIN, *Samuel*, 69-70.

⁶⁸ G. VON RAD, "The Tent and the Ark" (1931), *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London 1984) 103-124.

⁶⁹ For example, TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 191: "The conception of the ark as a visible sign of Yahweh's presence gave a military importance to the ark. [...] It functioned as a battle palladium for the armies of Israel; it showed that the Lord was present and fighting for Israel". See also MCCARTER, *Samuel*, 109.

⁷⁰ FIRTH, *Samuel*, 85.

Bergen agrees and also recognizes the parallel themes of ch. 8: “[Sending for the ark] might have been an attempt by the elders to twist God’s arm into helping them instead of trying to find out the reason for God’s displeasure. 1 Sam 8,4 doesn’t speak well for the elders’ spiritual wisdom” ⁷¹. This similarity is also noticed by Tsumura: “Here [the elders] took the initiative in bringing the ark of the Lord from Shiloh while Eli was still officially the judge. At a later time, the elders of Israel took the initiative in demanding a king of Samuel the judge” ⁷². He goes on to observe: “The people treated this sacred object without respect as an instrument through which victory might be attained. [...] that the ark would inevitably grant victory is a persistent idea” ⁷³. Likewise Campbell: “The presence of the ark, therefore, can be counted on to assure victory” ⁷⁴.

The ark of course fails to achieve this objective, but the story does not end there. Israel’s military history resumes in 7,7, where now it is Samuel who is accompanied by YHWH in battle. 1 Sam 7,13 indicates that he fills this role successfully, and the ark is duly abandoned (7,2) and plays no further role until it is brought to Jerusalem by David ⁷⁵. Since, as noted above, the elders demonstrate little spiritual enlightenment between chs. 4 and 8, it is likely that they believe Samuel has YHWH on a leash as well. This is why they are not rejecting him (8,7); he has performed admirably, as they say so themselves in ch. 12. But they also have enough pattern recognition to know that when he goes, his sons are not going to be able to make the ark “work” any more than Hophni and Phinehas could. However, rather than “return to the Lord” as Samuel tells them to do in 7,3 (and again in 12,14.20-21), they fall back on the same trick of divine manipulation. “You are old, and your sons do not follow your ways” (5a). Their judge is dying and their palladium is useless, so what do they ask for? This is the same thing their neighbors use to manipulate their gods: “Now appoint a king to lead us, such as all the nations have” (5b).

⁷¹ BERGEN, *Samuel*, 91.

⁷² TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 190. See also WÉNIN, *Samuel*, 146.

⁷³ TSUMURA, *Samuel*, 190-91.

⁷⁴ CAMPBELL, *Ark*, 150.

⁷⁵ See CAMPBELL, *Ark*, 201.

VIII. Divine Manipulation

One of the primary functions of an ancient Near Eastern king was to ensure the continued favor and attention of the gods ⁷⁶. In theory, as in Israel, this was accomplished by piety, ritual diligence, and maintenance of order and justice, but in practice the process was more subversive. As Greenwood notes, “Although the king proclaimed and portrayed a humble, unconditional piety, the reality was that service to the gods served a practical purpose. It provided a hope that the deities would, in turn, take care of the kings, whether in battle, in legacy, or in provisions” ⁷⁷. This is because, in ancient Near Eastern religion, humans were supposed to provide for the needs of the gods. “The literature from throughout the ancient Near East clearly addresses the fact that the gods have needs that are met by human beings. [...] rituals and other cultic activities were designed to address those needs. The king and the priests each had duties in the process” ⁷⁸. The neediness of the gods and their dependence (at least partially) on the services of the king — offering sacrifices, building and repairing temples, maintaining civic order so that ritual activity could proceed efficiently, etc. — gave the king some leverage with which to “negotiate” for the favor of the gods.

There are two issues involved here, both theologically problematic for orthodox Israel: the first is initiative, the second is dependence. As noted above, the elders of Israel take the initiative in hauling the ark to battle, rather than first inquiring of God. They do not want YHWH to decide when (or if, or against whom) wars will be fought; they want to decide this for themselves. A “king like the nations” is able to take this initiative; as long as he has been suitably attentive to his duties, the gods will fall in behind him:

I approached Ishtar the most high, I placed myself before her [...]. I am Asurbanipal, king of Assyria [...]. I am the one who visits regularly your dwellings, I come to worship you and take care of your rituals. [...] you are the most warlike among the gods! Scatter [the king of Elam] like a load in the tumult of battle; raise against him a destructive wind and storm! Ishtar heard my desperate sighs. [...]

⁷⁶ WALTON, *Thought*, 281-83.

⁷⁷ GREENWOOD, *Aššur*, 86.

⁷⁸ WALTON, *Thought*, 136.

fire flashed in her face, and she went raging away, directing her anger against Teumman, king of Elam, who had made her furious ⁷⁹.

Or they will give the king *carte blanche* to do as he wishes, with their support:

Marduk, the king of gods, is reconciled with the king my lord. He does whatever the king my lord says. Sitting on your throne, you will vanquish your enemies, conquer your foes and plunder the enemy. Bel has said, “may Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, be seated on his throne [...]. I will deliver the countries into his hands!” The king may happily do as he deems best ⁸⁰.

But in either case they will help him to do what he wants:

Tukulti-Ninurta, king of the universe, king of Assyria [...] the king whom the gods have helped to obtain his desired victories ⁸¹.

At that time Ashurnasirpal [...] whose desires the God Enlil helped him obtain so that his great hand conquered all princes insubmissive to him ⁸²

Incidentally, this is probably what Saul is trying to do in 13,9-12 (and perhaps again in 15,15): demonstrate royal piety to ensure divine cooperation/favor ⁸³. In any other nation this would have worked, but in Israel it costs him his dynasty. Only one Israelite leader ever got away with taking initiative over YHWH: “Joshua said to the Lord in the presence of Israel” (Josh 10,12). Joshua gives instructions to YHWH, which YHWH follows: “There has never been a day like it before or since, a day when the Lord listened to a human being” (10,14). Why Joshua is allowed to get away with this is not explained, but the text notes explicitly that this is a unique

⁷⁹ Excerpted from “101 Ashurbanipal Prism B”, in M. NISSINEN, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (SBLWAW; Atlanta, GA 2003) 146-148.

⁸⁰ Excerpted from “106 Bel-ušezib to Esarhaddon”, in NISSINEN, *Prophets*, 157.

⁸¹ Tukulti-Ninurta 1 A.O.78.5 1-10, in A.K. GRAYSON, *Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennium* (RIMA 1; Toronto 1987) 244.

⁸² Ashurnasirpal II A.O.101.1 38-40, in GRAYSON, *Assyrian Rulers*, 196.

⁸³ Gunn in particular notes that pinpointing the actual offense of Saul is very difficult in light of Saul’s apparent diligence and piety (GUNN, *Saul*, 38).

occurrence. YHWH refuses to be treated like an ordinary ancient Near Eastern god.

The other issue is divine dependence. Because the gods have needs, the kings can actually bribe the gods and thereby gain their support:

Ashurnasirpal [...] whose deeds and offerings the great gods of heaven and underworld love and (therefore) [...] granted to his dominion their fierce weapons ⁸⁴.

Because of my voluntary offerings and my prayers to the goddess Ishtar, the mistress who loves my priesthood, approved of me and she made up her mind to make war and battle ⁸⁵.

Unlike the indications of license granted in response to piety, these lines indicate that the deeds/offerings/prayers were given specifically to ensure military support. Sometimes they are not even subtle about it:

Because I [...] quickly completed the pure temple, the exalted shrine, for the abode of the gods Anu and Adad, the great gods, my lords, and [thereby] pleased their great divinity [...] may they subdue under me all enemy lands, rebellious mountain regions, and rulers hostile to me ⁸⁶.

This king wastes no words in reminding the gods that they owe him, and that he expects them to deliver. But sometimes the king does not even have to deliver before demanding; a “king like the nations” can hold out promises like a carrot on a stick. As Cartledge observes concerning a selection of royal vows, “these readings underscore the conditional nature of the vow; a promise had been made earlier and was later fulfilled because the deity had heard Bar-Hadad’s request” ⁸⁷. In one instance, we even observe the deity complaining that the king has neglected his part of the bargain:

The word of Ishtar to Esarhaddon, king of Assyria [...] did I not vanquish your enemy? [...] what have you given me? There is no

⁸⁴ Ashurnasirpal II A.0.101.1 24-26, in GRAYSON, *Assyrian Rulers*, 195.

⁸⁵ Ashurnasirpal II A.0.101.1 37-38, in GRAYSON, *Assyrian Rulers*, 196.

⁸⁶ Tiglath-Pileser I A.0.87, in GRAYSON, *Assyrian Rulers*, 29.

⁸⁷ T.W. CARTLEDGE, *Vows in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (JSOTSS 147; Sheffield 1992) 127.

food for my banquet [...]. I am waiting for [it] [...]. I have vanquished your enemy [...] from this you shall see that I am Ishtar ⁸⁸.

No Israelite king could ever get away with this. YHWH will not rush to their aid in battle and then beg for food. But this is exactly what a “king like the nations” is supposed to do, and this is exactly what the elders want when they ask for one. A “king like the nations” means “a god like the nations”. There is no secularism here; a passive, codependent God whose support and attention is urgently sought is nowhere near the same thing as no God at all. But a passive, codependent God is not what YHWH is. And this is exactly what YHWH means when he says, “they have rejected me”.

IX. Conclusion: Is God irritated with the idea of kingship or with the elders?

Commentators on 1 Samuel 8 generally try to find the source of YHWH’s irritation with the request for a king as having something to do with the institution of kingship, either as a sociopolitical or theological construct. But a synchronic reading of the Deuteronomistic History as a whole, or even just the books of Samuel, will not allow for such a ubiquitously negative interpretation. Further, the desire that their king be “like the nations” means that their request cannot be reduced to any form of secularism or atheism. Therefore, the problem does not lie in the object of the request, but in those who make it. The elders of Israel believe that they can manipulate their God into serving them. They have tried this before in ch. 4, using the ark of the covenant to drag God into battle. This attempt failed, and the ark was lost; even after its return they will not ask for it again. Now that Samuel is old, the ability he has demonstrated to bring YHWH to battle will soon be lost, and his corrupt sons have no chance of being able to “operate” the ark. Therefore, to replace their now useless palladium, the elders ask for a king. YHWH’s irritation is not with a king or kingship; the problem is the elders.

A “king like the nations” oversees the entire social (and cultic) operation that exists to meet the needs of the gods. While the king

⁸⁸ Excerpted from “3.5 The Word of Ishtar of Arbela”, in S. PARPOLA, *Assyrian Prophecies* (SAA IX; Helsinki 1997) 25-27.

derives his power from the gods and is compelled to care for and obey them, his position also allows him leverage to negotiate with them. Thus, when the king calls the gods out to battle, the gods comply. But a proper Israelite king does not attempt to manipulate Israel's God. This is the significance of David returning the ark to Jerusalem. His first attempt to move the ark under his own initiative ends in disaster — specifically to make a point — but the move is resumed under the auspices of YHWH⁸⁹. Not only is David not content to ignore the ark and implicitly take its place, as Saul the ideal ancient Near Eastern king seems to have done, but he actually runs before it (2 Sam 6,14.16) taking the “assistant” position that the gods are supposed to take in the vanguard. Also noteworthy is the fact that David refuses to take the ark with his army into exile (15,25); instead he recognizes that if YHWH has done this to him. (2 Sam 15:25 and 2 Sam 6:11), the ark is not going to help, which is the opposite of how the elders think in 1 Sam 4,3.

But the elders do not want an Israelite king; they want a “king like the nations”. Instead of asking why YHWH might not want to help them in battle, they look for a way to make him fight anyway, whether he wants to or not. The loss of the ark should have been a motive for repentance, but instead they insist, notwithstanding Samuel's successful tenure as a makeshift palladium. The elders want a god they can manipulate, and they want a king to manipulate him. It is this kind of king, performing this role, that constitutes rejection of YHWH.

217 E Cripe Street
South Bend, IN 46637
U.S.A.

Jonathan H. WALTON

SUMMARY

Commentators on 1 Samuel 8 offer a variety of interpretations about what the requested king is expected to replace: judgeship, YHWH himself, or Israel's covenant identity. This article demonstrates that none of these proposals account for the Biblical text adequately. It is proposed instead that the king is intended to replace the Ark of the Covenant. The king will then manipulate YHWH into leading in battle. This is what ancient Near Eastern kings were able to do with their gods, and what the ark failed to do in 1 Samuel 4.

⁸⁹ CAMPBELL, *Ark*, 133, 163.

Matthew, Philo, and Mercy for Animals (Matt 12,9-14)

The treatment of issues relating to Sabbath observance in the Gospel of Matthew is concentrated in two closely related pericopae, Matt 12,1-8 and 12,9-14¹. Both stories not only concern the Sabbath but also occur on the Sabbath, the first outdoors, the second indoors. Formally, each pericope bears the hallmarks of a controversy story, the latter also incorporating elements of a healing story. In fact, as Borish Repschinski has shown, Matthean redaction has the effect of magnifying the character of both pericopae as controversy stories, thereby further binding them together, with the addition of καὶ μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν in 12,9 making the connection between the two even more apparent². In both stories Jesus interacts with the Pharisees (12,2.14), responding to their antagonistic remarks (12,2.10) with rhetorical questions (12,3.5.11)³, the debate between them revolving around what is “lawful” to do on the Sabbath (12,2.10.12)⁴. For his part, in both cases Jesus constructs arguments based on analogy (12,3-5.11) and draws comparisons between the lesser and the greater (12,6.12a). As interpreters often note, the two stories are also linked by the concept of mercy (ἐλεος): in the first story it informs Jesus’ words (12,7); in the second it informs his actions (12,13)⁵. Put differently, the conclusion that Jesus draws in 12,12 (i.e., that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath) “illustrates” the quotation of Hos 6,6 that he cites in 12,7 (“I desire mercy and not sacrifice”)⁶.

¹ For an overview, see A.J. MAYER-HAAS, “*Geschenk aus Gottes Schatzkammer*” (*bSchab 10b*). Jesus und der Sabbat im Spiegel der neutestamentlichen Schriften (NTAbh 43; Münster 2003) 411-493.

² B. REPSCHINSKI, *The Controversy Stories in the Gospel of Matthew* (FRLANT 189; Göttingen 2000) 94-116.

³ The speaking role assigned to the Pharisees in the latter story is redactional, a change that not only expands their verbal interaction with Jesus but also reinforces the parallelism with the first story.

⁴ The use of ἔξεστιν in 12,10 is redactional, as is the rhetorical question in 12,11.

⁵ Cf. H. FRANKEMÖLLE, *Matthäus Kommentar* (Düsseldorf 1997) II, 130; U. LUZ, *Matthew. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2005) II, 188; D.L. RIBEIRO, *La double controverse sur le shabbat selon Matthieu 12* (Lille 2010) 237-251.

⁶ W.D. DAVIES – D.C. ALLISON, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (ICC; London 1991) II, 320.

In the midst of all this complementarity, as one progresses from the first story to the second there is also a clear sense of escalation. While the events of the first story transpire in the relatively neutral site of a grainfield (12,1), those of the second take place in “their” synagogue (12,9), a venue of conflict and condemnation (cf. 10,17; 13,54). In keeping with this, while the Pharisees’ observation in 12,2 is clearly accusatory in tone, it is only in the second story that we learn that they are actually seeking to “accuse” Jesus (12,10) ⁷. Accompanying this intensification in the Pharisees’ animosity towards Jesus is a shift in the focus of their remarks. While the first story concerns the actions of Jesus’ disciples (12,1-2), the second concerns the authority of Jesus himself (12,9-10), extending claims that he has just made about being (or representing) something greater than the temple (12,6) as well as being (in his capacity as the Son of Man) lord of the Sabbath (12,8) ⁸. If the Pharisees are guilty of condemning “innocent” disciples (12,7) in the first story, in the second story they are guilty of conspiring to destroy the disciples’ innocent leader (12,14).

Within this context, exposing the nature of the Pharisees’ culpability specifically with respect to the Law represents a Matthean priority ⁹. As the evangelist sees things, Jesus’ opponents have failed both in their knowledge of the Law and in their ability to reason from the Law. In reply, what Jesus models in these episodes is not simply a particular interpretation of sabbatical practice but, more importantly, a particular way of reasoning about all religious practices. It is with regard to the latter that Jesus most fully differentiates himself from his interlocutors and most fully manifests the concrete implications of his messianic authority.

If attention is turned to the sources supporting his interpretation of sabbatical practice, it is evident that in fashioning a response to his critics the Matthean Jesus embraces a multipronged approach. Specifically, in the first pericope we have a haggadic analogy based on a biblical story (12,2-4; cf. 1 Sam 21,1-6), a halakhic precedent drawn from a statute “in the Law” (12,5-6; cf. Num 28,9-10), and a

⁷ For κατηγορέω as a legal technical term, see *BDAG* s.v. Cf. Exod 31,14.

⁸ J.P. MEIER, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York 2009) IV, 254.

⁹ Note that 12,5 (with its explicit reference to the Law) is redactional.

citation from one of the prophetic books (12,7; cf. Hos 6,6) ¹⁰. To this triad the second story adds a fourth argument, one based not on Scripture but on an assumption that Jesus makes regarding the common experience of his addressees (12,11-12). In what follows, I investigate the last of these arguments, concentrating on both its particular form of reasoning (which involves drawing analogies between the treatment of animals and the treatment of people) and the manner in which it strengthens the argument in 12,7 (which refers to the concept of mercy). In doing so, I build on the observations of Anthony Saldarini, who suggests that in 12,11-12 Jesus “is probably implicitly appealing to the principle of mercy in Hos. 6:6 (v. 7 in the previous conflict) and applying it to the suffering of the animal and then of the human” ¹¹, and of Lutz Doering, who suggests that the conclusion in 12,12 is “no halakhic ruling *sensu stricto*, but rather a commentary on Jesus’ practice of healing as an exemplification of the prerogative of mercy” ¹².

I. Sabbath Observance and the Treatment of Animals

An inspection of recent scholarship on Matt 12,11-12 reveals a concentration especially on two areas of investigation. The first has to do with comparing these verses with their synoptic co-texts (Mark 3,4; Luke 13,15-16; 14,5), the second with comparing these verses with early Jewish texts that discuss the sabbatical treatment of domestic animals. We begin with Matt 12,12b and Mark 3,4b.

ὥστε ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν καλῶς ποιεῖν. (Matt 12,12b)

ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι,
ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτείνειν; (Mark 3,4b)

¹⁰ The formula οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε in 12,3.5 both lends the unit structural integrity and draws attention to the scriptural provenance of the references.

¹¹ A.J. SALDARINI, *Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago, IL 1994) 133. Cf. L. LYBAEK, “Matthew’s Use of Hosea 6,6 in the Context of the Sabbath Controversies”, *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (ed. C.M. TUCKETT) (BETL 131; Louvain 1997) 493.

¹² L. DOERING, “Sabbath Laws in the New Testament Gospels”, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature* (eds. R. BIERINGER *et al.*) (JSJSup 136; Leiden 2010) 235.

Matthew renders Mark's double set of alternatives as a simple statement, converting the latter's rhetorical question into the declaration of a general rule ¹³. Evidently, for him the principle of saving life on the Sabbath (for which see *m. Yoma* 8.6) does not apply to the case at hand. What does apply is the illustration that he provides in 12,11, one that has a parallel not in Mark 3,1-6 but in Luke 14,5.

τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἓν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ; (Matt 12,11)

τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; (Luke 14,5)

Dissimilarities in wording and context suggest that Matthew and Luke accessed the logion not from Q but from variants in their respective *Sondergut* ¹⁴. In each case the application of the illustration includes the use of an analogy between the treatment of animals and the treatment of people in order to demonstrate the propriety of healing on the Sabbath ¹⁵. The version in Matt 12,11 refers to a sheep, in which case the illustration supports an *a fortiori* argument. Implicitly, the man with a withered hand (12,10) is likened to the sheep, Jesus is likened to the smallholder to whom the sheep belongs ¹⁶, and the man's healing is likened to the act of lifting the sheep out of the pit into which it has fallen ¹⁷. If "doing good" (12,12b)

¹³ He also emends ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι to καλῶς ποιεῖν, for which cf. Matt 5,16.

¹⁴ M. TRAUTMANN, *Zeichenhafte Handlungen Jesu*. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem geschichtlichen Jesus (FB 37; Würzburg 1980) 309-315; C. HEIL, *Lukas und Q*. Studien zur lukanischen Redaktion des Spruchevangeliums Q (BZNW 111; Berlin 2003) 74-80.

¹⁵ For the question of healing on the Sabbath, see CD 11.9c-10a; *m. Shab.* 6.2-3; 14.3-4; 22.6; *m. Yoma* 8.5; *m. 'Ed.* 2.5; *t. Shab.* 12.8-14; MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, IV, 244-255; SALDARINI, *Community*, 133, 272; L. DOERING, *Schabbat*. Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum (TSAJ 78; Tübingen 1999) 449-450; N.L. COLLINS, *Jesus, The Sabbath and the Jewish Debate*. Healing on the Sabbath in the 1st and 2nd Centuries CE (LNTS 474; London 2014).

¹⁶ The verbal construction (πρόβατον ἓν) may suggest that this is the person's only sheep. See LUZ, *Matthew*, II, 187; DOERING, *Schabbat*, 461.

¹⁷ Matthew is particularly fond of sheep imagery (cf. 7,15; 9,36; 10,6,16; 15,24; 25,32-33; 26,31; and esp. 18,12-13). The reference to sheep in 12,11

for the sheep on the Sabbath is lawful, then doing good for the man is even more so, since human beings are more valuable than sheep (12,12a). The version in Luke 14,5, on the other hand, refers to a child or an ox, in which case the illustration supports a mixed *a pari* and *a fortiori* argument¹⁸. Luke also differs from Matthew in referring to the site of the incident as a well rather than a pit, which corresponds to a difference in the analogy being drawn, namely, the act of healing a man suffering from dropsy (14,2) is likened to the act of saving a child or ox from drowning. In Luke 13,15-16, meanwhile, yet another kind of analogy is drawn, this time between the act of releasing a woman from the condition to which she has been “bound” by Satan and the act of releasing an ox or donkey from its stall¹⁹.

As noted above, unlike the trio of arguments in Matt 12,2-7, Matt 12,11 does not allude to a particular biblical source. Exod 21,33-34 considers a case in which an ox or donkey falls into a pit and dies, while Deut 22,4 instructs the reader to help raise an ox or donkey that has fallen down (cf. Exod 23,5)²⁰. Neither text, however, refers to Sabbath observance. For a better parallel in this regard we must turn to a non-biblical source, CD 11.13-14.

One may not assist an animal in giving birth on the Sabbath. And if it falls into a pit or a trap, he shall not lift it out on the Sabbath²¹.

These regulations (cf. 4Q265, frag. 2, 1.5-6) belong to the so-called Sabbath Code (CD 10.14-11.18), the stringency of which may reflect the importance of sabbatical praxis for the Essene’s project of sectarian legitimation and differentiation²². With that in

may also reinforce the connection with 12,3-4, which refers to David. Cf. Y.S. CHAE, *Jesus as the Eschatological Shepherd*. Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew (WUNT II/216; Tübingen 2006) 239.

¹⁸ J.A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28; New York 1985) II, 1041.

¹⁹ Cf. *m. Shab.* 7.2; 15.1-2; DOERING, *Schabbat*, 463-468; F. BOVON, *Luke. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2013) II, 283-290.

²⁰ DAVIES – ALLISON, *Saint Matthew*, II, 320, refer to Deut 22,4 as part of the “background” for the verse.

²¹ For translation and commentary, see B.Z. WACHOLDER, *The New Damascus Document* (STDJ 56; Leiden 2007) 91, 337.

²² DOERING, *Schabbat*, 133-215; L.H. SCHIFFMAN, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden 1975) 84-133. Cf. *Jub.* 2.25-33; 50.6-13.

view, CD 11.13-14 can be compared with somewhat more lenient sabbatical rulings preserved in rabbinic literature, for example, *m. Bet.* 3.4 (which allows an unblemished firstling to be pulled from a pit if it is to be slaughtered on a festival), *b. Shab.* 128b (which allows cushions and bedding to be placed under the animal in hopes that it can extricate itself), and *t. Shab.* 14.3 (which allows food to be provided for the animal in order to keep it alive)²³.

In assessing the contribution of Matt 12,11-12 to our understanding of early Jewish halakhah, it is important to bear in mind that Jesus formulates the illustration in 12,11 as a rhetorical question. In other words, he simply assumes that his Pharisaic interlocutors will agree that the sort of merciful assistance depicted in this verse represents a widely accepted practice: "Jesus rhetorically draws his audience to his side with the presumption that ... these humane measures are as obvious to them as they are to him"²⁴. Indeed, this assumption is essential to his aim of exposing the hypocritical nature of the Pharisees' position: "When they admit to helping an animal on the Sabbath but question helping a person on the Sabbath, their interpretation of the law is shown up as illogical and immoral"²⁵. In the same vein, Jesus employs not only an illustration that would have been familiar to his opponents but a form of argumentation that would have been familiar to them as well, a point made by Doering: "Formally, the Matthean argument is a conclusion *a minori ad maius* and is therefore close to the rabbinic reasoning *qal wa-homer*, which was particularly in use with respect to issues about overriding the Sabbath commandment"²⁶.

According to a recent study²⁷, the *qal wa-homer* (one of the major hermeneutical rules or *middot* of rabbinic literature) is an *a fortiori* inference consisting of "an analogical transfer" between

²³ Cf. *b. Bet.* 37a; DOERING, *Schabbat*, 194-195, 459-460; SALDARINI, *Community*, 271-272.

²⁴ MEIER, *Marginal Jew*, IV, 263. Similar points are made by REPSCHINSKI, *Controversy Stories*, 110; SALDARINI, *Community*, 132; Y.-E. YANG, *Jesus and the Sabbath in Matthew's Gospel* (JSNTSup 139; Sheffield 1997) 203.

²⁵ REPSCHINSKI, *Controversy Stories*, 111.

²⁶ DOERING, "Sabbath Laws", 223-224. Cf. MEIER, *Marginal Jew*, II, 684; IV, 259; REPSCHINSKI, *Controversy Stories*, 111; SALDARINI, *Community*, 132; YANG, *Sabbath*, 179.

²⁷ A. SAMELY, *Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture in the Mishnah* (Oxford 2002) 174.

two subjects, with the means of inference involving both the assignment of categories to the two subjects as well as the ranking of the categories in a graded dimension of comparison. In the case of Matt 12,11, the two categories for comparison are animals and people, the ranking of which is stated in 12,12a. The argument as such entails transferring something that is known about the subject of lower rank to the subject of higher rank, with the claim that the validity of the inferred proposition is greater for the subject of higher rank than for the subject from which the proposition is inferred.

While Doering is correct that this type of reasoning was applied by the rabbis to cases concerning Sabbath observance (e.g., *t. Shab.* 15.16), like other interpreters he fails to note that the use of *a minori ad maius* comparisons was fairly widespread in the ancient world²⁸. In fact, moral arguments involving *a minori ad maius* comparisons between human and non-human subjects were used by various authors in antiquity, including non-rabbinic as well as rabbinic authors²⁹. For various illustrations of the former, we can turn to the work of one such author, Philo of Alexandria.

II. Philo and the Humane Treatment of Animals

Many of Philo's observations about animals are located in a set of compositions known as the Exposition of the Law, an apologetic reconfiguration of Jewish law and history (evidently written for non-Jews as well as Jews) meant to establish the excellence of Judaism with reference to an array of moral, legal, and cultural values esteemed by the Greco-Roman host culture³⁰. One place where we find a concentration of such observations is in *De humanitate* (= *Virt.* 51-174), a sub-treatise belonging to a larger unit of the Exposition that endeavors to show how, contrary to its critics, the Mosaic

²⁸ For examples, see D. DAUBE, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric", *HUCA* 22 (1949) 251-257.

²⁹ For examples of the latter, see *m. Hull.* 12.5; *b. B. Mes.* 88b.

³⁰ P. BORGES, *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden 1997) 63-79; J. MORRIS, "The Jewish Philosopher Philo", *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 3, part 2 (eds. E. SCHÜRER – G. VERMES *et al.*) (Edinburgh 1987) 840-856; W.T. WILSON, *Philo of Alexandria. On Virtues* (PACS 3; Leiden 2011) 1-10.

Law educates its adherents in virtue³¹. In the case of *De humanitate*, Philo endeavors to show how the virtue of humanity (φιλανθρωπία) was so important to Moses that in his legislation its application extends to the treatment not only of various categories of people (the poor, slaves, enemies, non-Jews) but even to the categories of animals and plants.

He establishes fairness and gentleness not only among the associations that people have with one another, but with great lavishness he also pours them out richly and extends them even to animals who are by nature irrational and to the different species of cultivated trees. (*Hum.* 81)

Indeed, in the section of the sub-treatise devoted to a review of specific statutes (§§ 80-160), Philo dedicates nearly as much space to laws concerning animals and plants (§§ 125-60) as he does to laws that explicitly mention the treatment of human beings (§§ 82-124)³². This decision on his part indicates something both about the importance of such laws in making his case as well as something about how he thinks such laws ought to be interpreted. Specifically, as Katell Berthelot has shown, the form of reasoning that guides the Alexandrian in his interpretation of these laws combines analogical arguments with arguments *a minori ad maius*³³. In each case, he discerns an underlying principle informing a law that refers to the treatment of animals, and then suggests that the principle applies by analogy even more so to the treatment of people. As we shall see, the moral implications of the principle at hand are often illuminated with recourse to one or more concepts related both to φιλανθρωπία and to one another, especially fairness (ἐπιείκεια), gentleness (ἡμερότης), kindness (χρηστότης), and mercy (ἔλεος)³⁴.

³¹ See especially *Spec.* 4.133-135, a transitional statement that identifies a whole “choir” of virtues, namely, wisdom, justice, piety, and moderation, to which he later adds courage (*Virt.* 1) and humanity (*Virt.* 51). Cf. *Spec.* 2.62-63, 167.

³² The central section of the sub-treatise is organized according to three broad categories of moral referents: people (§§ 82-124), animals (§§ 125-147), and plants (§§ 148-160), presented in the reverse order of creation.

³³ K. BERTHELOT, *Philanthrôpia Judaica: Le débat autour de la “misanthropie” des lois juives dans l’Antiquité* (JSJSup 76; Leiden 2003) 288-293.

³⁴ *Hum.* 125, 127, 134, 140, 141, 144, 146, 148, 160.

A sense of the Alexandrian's priorities in support of this agenda can be deduced from the summary statement with which the section on animals and plants concludes.

You see how much graciousness and kindness (τὸ χρηστόν) he displays, and how he pours them forth on every kind, first of people ... then of irrational animals ... and finally of sown crops as well as trees. For one who has already learned fairness (ἐπιείκειαν) in dealing with living things that lack perception will commit no wrong against those endowed with a soul, and one who does not attempt violence against beings with a soul is by extension (πόρρωθεν) instructed to take care of those that have reason. (*Hum.* 160)

Lacking perception, in the order of created things plants are inferior to animals, which, lacking reason, in turn are inferior to human beings. The use of πόρρωθεν (literally, "from afar") in communicating this hierarchy accords with the distance that in Philo's view separates the different categories (cf. *Spec.* 4.203, 218; *Hum.* 116). As he contends elsewhere, the chief difference in the case of animals and human beings is to be found in the fact that the former are devoid of λόγος (cf. *Opif.* 73; *Spec.* 2.83, 89; 4.123).

Appealing to such a distinction, however, was not something that could simply be taken for granted but rather signals the Alexandrian's participation in a long-standing philosophical debate³⁵. On the one hand, Platonists like Plutarch and Porphyry held that because animals are in fact possessed of λόγος (albeit in imperfect forms), human beings have a kinship with them in reason and are therefore obligated to extend them justice³⁶. The Stoics, on the other hand, argued that λόγος constitutes "the categorical boundary marker between humans and animals"³⁷. Because the former have no community with the latter in reason, they have no community with them in justice³⁸. Instead, an-

³⁵ For an overview of the basic positions, see R. SORABJI, *Animal Minds and Human Morals. The Origins of the Western Debate* (London 1993) 107-121.

³⁶ See especially PLUTARCH, *De sollertia animalium*; PORPHYRY, *De abstinentia*; cf. SEXTUS EMPIRICUS, *Pyrr.* 1.62-77.

³⁷ I.S. GILHUS, *Animals, Gods and Humans. Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas* (London 2006) 3. Cf. *SVF* II, 714-737.

³⁸ E.g., *SVF* III, 367-376; MARCUS AURELIUS, *Med.* 6.23; M. POHLENZ, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung* (Göttingen 1970) I, 98-101.

imals exist for the sake of human beings, and their primary purpose is to serve them³⁹. That Philo was familiar with the particulars of this debate, and that he sided with the Stoics in such particulars, is evident from his treatise, *De animalibus*, in which he concludes: "To elevate animals to the level of the human race and to grant equality to unequals is the height of injustice. To ascribe serious self-restraint to indifferent and almost invisible creatures is to insult those whom nature has endowed with the best part" (*Anim.* 100)⁴⁰.

Returning to *De humanitate*, in light of such comments what makes the inclusion of animals (not to mention plants) remarkable in Philo's survey of laws is not their presumed similarity with human beings but rather their presumed dissimilarity. In his opinion, Moses' commitment to the virtue of humanity was so prolific and his concern to universalize its practice so profound, that his laws extended its application even to "indifferent and almost invisible creatures", the assumption being that the legislation concerning animals serves as a form of training through which the practitioners of the law become even more humane in their treatment of other people.

For evidence of this, we can start with Philo's commentary on Exod 23,5, the injunction to help lift up an enemy's draft animal that has fallen under its burden (cf. Deut 22,4). According to his interpretation, obedience to this statute promotes gentleness (ἡμερότης) insofar as it teaches by extension (πὸρρωθεν) that one should succumb to neither *Schadenfreude* nor envy in dealing with other people (*Hum.* 116). His reasoning as to the injunction's pedagogical effect on its adherents implies a certain analogy between the two forms of moral action, even as it also presupposes a certain hierarchy in the referents of such action: "Who would disregard any human being, with whom he has a single natural kinship, when he has been taught by the divine law and is accustomed not to disregard even a beast?" (*QE* 2.12). Similarly, according to *Spec.* 4.203, the law prohibiting owners from mating their cattle with an-

³⁹ E.g., CICERO, *Fin.* 3.67; EPICETUS, *Diatr.* 1.6.12-22; 1.16.1-21; *SVF* II, 1152-1167; cf. U. DIERAUER, *Tier und Mensch im Denken der Antike*. Studien zur Tierpsychologie, Anthropologie und Ethik (Amsterdam 1977) 224-245.

⁴⁰ Translation from A. TERIAN, *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus*. The Armenian Text with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary (Chico, CA 1981) 108. For the Stoic concept of teleological anthropocentrism, see PHILO, *Mos.* 1.60-62; 2.22; *Spec.* 2.69; 4.119-121.

imals of a different species (Lev 19,19; Deut 22,9-11) works by extension (πόρρωθεν) towards the prevention of adultery, indicating its sinfulness “more clearly” (τρανυτέραν).

A somewhat more elaborate example can be found at *Hum.* 125-133. Philo begins with the claim that through his laws Moses grants a share of kindness (χρηστότης) “even to the order of irrational animals” (§ 125). As evidence of this, he cites the statute forbidding the sacrifice of newborn animals until they are at least eight days old (Lev 22,27). Having explicated the rationale for the ban and the manner in which it accords with “nature” (§§ 126-130), he then argues (§§ 131-133) that the statute forbids by implication the exposure of human infants as well: “Do you not see that our most excellent lawgiver took care concerning the irrational animals lest the offspring be separated from their mother before they have been breastfed? Even more (τὸ πλέον), good parents, was this established on your account, so that you might be taught familial affection, if not by nature then at least by instruction” (*Hum.* 133)⁴¹. Here, as elsewhere in the sub-treatise (§§ 116, 160, 165, 168; cf. *QE* 2.12), Philo presents the law as a form of instruction (μάθησις) through which Moses aims to teach (ἀναδιδάσκειν) his followers how to acquire the necessary moral dispositions, in this case familial affection or τὸ φιλοίκειον (cf. *Ios.* 246; *Mos.* 1.12; *Spec.* 2.80)⁴². A further example of this occurs in *Spec.* 4.205-206, where he interprets Deut 22,10 (which forbids a bull to be yoked with a donkey) as a lesson (μάθησις) for judges not to discriminate against the lowly born (cf. *Hum.* 147).

The same kind of approach informs Philo’s exposition of the sabbatical year legislation about allowing the land to lie fallow (Exod 23,10-11; Lev 25,1-7). For example, in *Spec.* 4.218 he explains that sabbatical year enactments regarding the treatment of plants restrain covetous desires directed against people by extension (μακρόθεν), since these are “greater matters” (μειζόνων). In *Spec.* 2.86-109 (cf. *Hum.* 97-98), meanwhile, he reviews the various reasons that Moses had for establishing this legislation, including the idea that

⁴¹ Cf. PHILO, *Hypoth.* 7.7. For the importance of learning from nature, cf. *Post.* 185; *Ios.* 129.

⁴² Cf. JOSEPHUS, *C. Ap.* 2.213: “He educated us (ἐξεπαίδευσεν) in gentleness and humanity so completely that he does not overlook the irrational animals, authorizing their use only in accordance with the law”.

it is altogether inappropriate to burden and oppress other people. For if the different parts of the earth, which by nature share in neither pleasure nor pain, ought to be given a share of rest, how much more (πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον) must this be the case with people, who possess not only the sense that is common to the irrational animals but also the special gift of reason? (*Spec.* 2.89)

Accordingly, the law teaches masters to refrain from imposing severe orders on their slaves (*Spec.* 2.90-91), and rulers to refrain from imposing heavy taxes on their subjects (*Spec.* 2.92-95). Those who fail in this regard, he says, have failed to learn the importance of showing mercy (ἔλεος) to those most in need of it (*Spec.* 2.96).

The theme of mercy also plays a role in *Hum.* 137-141, a passage in which Philo explains why Moses prohibited his followers from sacrificing pregnant animals. Although he refers to it as a νόμος, the prohibition as such is not found in scripture, but rather is something that Philo infers from Lev 22,28 (discussed in §§ 134-136), perhaps under the influence of oral tradition (cf. 4QMMT B 36; 4Q270 9 ii 14-15; 11QT LII 5; *m. Hul.* 4.5). At any rate, it was from this precedent, he says, that the lawgivers of other nations derived the rule that a pregnant woman condemned to death must not be executed until she has delivered her child (§ 139). In Philo's opinion, this claim serves as proof that Moses "extends the duty of fair treatment to irrational animals, so that by practicing (ἀσκήσαντες) on species of different kinds we might exercise humanity even more so (πολλῇ τινι περιουσίᾳ) among beings of like kind to ourselves" (§ 140)⁴³. Contrary to his detractors, then, the legislation of Moses does not promote inhumane and antisocial practices, but rather "these laws obviously grant a share of mercy (ἐλέου) even to herds of cattle, and the people through the guidance of customs learned from their earliest youth amend any disobedience in their souls to a civilized disposition" (§ 141). Shortly thereafter (in a discussion of Exod 23,19; 34,26; Deut 14,21), he goes on to identify ἔλεος as the "passion that is most indispensable and most closely related to the rational soul" (§ 144)⁴⁴. As David

⁴³ The acquisition of virtue depends on three elements (nature, instruction, and practice), the last of which is explicitly addressed here. Cf. *Abr.* 52-54; *Ios.* 1; *Mos.* 1.76; *Spec.* 4.24; *Hum.* 133; *Praem.* 65.

⁴⁴ The classification of mercy as one of the passions reflects Stoic influence, e.g., DIOGENES LAERTIUS, *Vit. phil.* 7.111; cf. *SVF* III, 394, 413-414, 416; CICERO, *Tusc.* 4.18; PLUTARCH, *Stoic. rep.* 1046B-C.

Konstan observes, with this statement Philo is assigning mercy “a place of privilege in relation to reason”, thereby elevating its status in his scheme of moral values ⁴⁵. His motivation for doing so at this particular juncture in the Exposition may reflect the influence of Jewish traditions, as evidenced by *T. Zeb.* 5.1 (“show mercy to your neighbor and have compassion towards all, not only towards people but also irrational animals”) as well as an array of other texts that enjoin the humane treatment of animals ⁴⁶. In any case, *Spec.* 2.96 and *Hum.* 141 and 144 make it plain that animals as well as people are to be included among the recipients of ἔλεος, which should be extended (according to passages elsewhere in the Exposition) especially to the needy (e.g., *Spec.* 1.308; 2.115) and to those who have experienced misfortune (e.g., *Decal.* 69; *Spec.* 2.138; 4.76).

As noted previously, in developing these sorts of positions, it is apparent that Philo was not operating in an intellectual vacuum. On the contrary, it appears that he was deliberately participating in a broader conversation taking place among ancient moralists about the relationship between people and animals. That he would enter into such a conversation within the context of a discussion about φιλανθρωπία is worthy of attention, particularly when we take into account a text such as the following.

For the sake of humanity (φιλανθρώπου) we should accustom (προεθιστέον) ourselves to mildness and kindness in our dealings with other creatures. I certainly would not sell an ox that had worked for me, just because it was old, much less an elderly man. (Plutarch, *Cato* 5.5)

Like Philo, Plutarch draws a hierarchically organized analogy between the treatment of animals and the treatment of people. Also like Philo, he sees kindness to animals as a type of training in hu-

⁴⁵ D. KONSTAN, “Philo’s *De virtutibus* in the Perspective of Classical Greek Philosophy”, *SPhA* 18 (2006) 67.

⁴⁶ E.g., Prov 12,10; Sir 18,13; 2 *En.* 58.1-59.5; Ps.-Phoc. 84-85, 139-140, 188; PHILO, *Hypoth.* 7.7, 9; JOSEPHUS, *C. Ap.* 2.213-214; *b. Shab.* 128b. For the rabbinic concept of *tza’ar ba’alei hayyim*, see E.J. SCHOCHET, *Animal Life in Jewish Traditions* (New York 1984) 151-155. Concerning Lev 22,28 (which forbids the slaughter of an animal and its young together), the *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* writes: “Just as I in heaven am merciful, so shall you be merciful on earth”.

manity that contributes to the moral formation of its practitioners: “Who could wrong a human being when he found himself so gently and humanely disposed towards other non-human creatures?” (*Esu carn.* 996A)⁴⁷. In the sentence preceding this question, he describes the development of such a disposition as a means of ἔθισμός (“habituation”) in the virtue of humanity. Opinions of this sort were sometimes voiced in conjunction with arguments against animal sacrifice and the consumption of animal flesh, arguments that were associated especially with the legacy of Pythagoras⁴⁸. According to Iamblichus, for example, he

ordered abstinence from living beings for many reasons, but mainly because the practice tended to promote peace. For once human beings become accustomed (ἐθιζόμενοι) to loathe the slaughter of animals as lawless and contrary to nature, they would no longer make war, thinking it even more (πολὺ μᾶλλον) unlawful to kill a human being⁴⁹. (*Vit. Pythag.* 30.186)

The author’s working assumption is that habituation to the humane treatment of animals shapes more humane patterns of conduct towards other people. A similar sort of argument *a minori ad maius* is employed by Porphyry in *Abst.* 3.26.6: “One who abstains from all animate creatures, even those that do not make a social contract with him, will abstain all the more (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) from harm to his own kind”⁵⁰. He goes on to interpret comportment guided by these principles as a means of safeguarding the practice of justice, a virtue that Philo closely aligned with humanity (e.g., Philo, *Mos.* 2.9; *Decal.* 164; *Spec.* 2.63). Such comparisons, then, indicate that in

⁴⁷ Cf. *Inim. util.* 91C; *Sollert.* 959E-960A; É. DE FONTENAY, “La philanthrôpie à l’épreuve des bêtes”, *L’animal dans l’antiquité* (eds. B. CASSIN – J.-L. LABARRIÈRE) (Paris 1997) 281-298.

⁴⁸ DIERAUER, *Tier und Mensch*, 285-293; SORABJI, *Animal Minds*, 170-194.

⁴⁹ Translation from J. DILLON – J. HERSHBELL, *Iamblichus. On the Pythagorean Way of Life* (SBLTT 29; Atlanta, GA 1991) 195. Cf. BERTHELOT, *Philanthrôpie*, 294-297.

⁵⁰ Translation from G. CLARK, *Porphyry. On Abstinence from Killing Animals* (London 2000) 97. Porphyry may be drawing on the theories of Theophrastus, who is mentioned by name in *Abst.* 3.25.1 as well as in 3.23.3, shortly after a passage that parallels 3.26.6 (i.e., 2.31.3). See J. BOUFFARTIGUES – M. PATILLON, *Porphyre. De l’abstinence* (Paris 1979) II, 25-26, 29.

his survey of the law in *De humanitate* and related texts Philo was drawing not only upon specific concepts (e.g., φιλανθρωπία) but also upon specific forms of argumentation (and the assumptions informing them) familiar from Greco-Roman moral thought, all in an effort to assert for the law a place of respect within its cultural and intellectual environment.

III. Learning the Law, Mercy for the Other

As we have seen, in 12,1-14 Matthean redaction has the effect of (1) binding the two controversy stories about Sabbath observance more closely together, and (2) introducing the theme of mercy (ἔλεος) and the use of arguments *a minori ad maius* into Jesus' side of the debate. In addition, it is also important to recognize how the evangelist has created a new literary context for these stories, especially by prefacing them with Jesus' invitation to discipleship in 11,28-30, material which is unparalleled in either Mark or Luke. Insofar as the terms ἀναπαύειν (11,28) and ἀνάπαυσις (11,29) were often used to give expression to Sabbath rest, the passage is connected thematically with what follows⁵¹. The use of the phrase ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ in both 11,25 (cf. Luke 10,21) and 12,1 (cf. Mark 2,23) further reinforces the connection. Moreover, given the references in 11,29-30 to his "yoke" (a common symbol for Torah obedience)⁵², what one would "learn from me" (μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ) in 11,29 presumably includes Jesus' instruction on the Law. The debates about Sabbath observance in 12,1-14, then, can be taken as examples of what (and how) the disciples are invited to learn from Jesus in 11,29⁵³.

As Celia Deutsch observes, 11,28-30 also prepares the way for 12,1-14 insofar as the former's contrastive structure accords with

⁵¹ FRANKEMÖLLE, *Matthäus*, II, 130; J. LAANSMA, "I Will Give You Rest". The Rest Motif in the New Testament with Special Reference to Mt 11 and Heb 3-4 (WUNT II/98; Tübingen 1997) 89-91, 246.

⁵² Jer 5,5; Acts 15,10; Gal 5,1; *m. Ber.* 2.2; *m. Abot* 3.5; 2 *En.* 34.1; 2 *Bar.* 41.3

⁵³ MAYER-HAAS, *Geschenk*, 437-439; DAVIES – ALLISON, *Saint Matthew*, II, 289; LAANSMA, *Rest*, 210.

the latter's anti-Pharisaic thrust ⁵⁴. For his part, Jesus claims to be "gentle and humble" in spirit (11,29; cf. Num 12,3; Matt 5,5; 21,5). His yoke, accordingly, is χρηστός ("easy, kind, benevolent"), a term often joined in Scripture with ἔλεος ⁵⁵. All this contrasts with the "burdens" borne by those addressed in 11,28, which anticipates Jesus' polemic against the "heavy burdens" imposed on others by the scribes and the Pharisees in 23,4, which in turn contrast ironically with the "heavier" matters of the law that according to Jesus they have failed to observe (23,23), namely, justice, mercy (ἔλεος), and faithfulness ⁵⁶. The mercy that informs the interpretation of Sabbath observance in 12,1-14, then, illustrates both the "gentle" nature of the teacher himself as well as the "benevolent" nature of his yoke, that is, his way of interpreting the Law ⁵⁷.

Such observations are germane to comparisons that might be drawn between Philo's representation of the Mosaic Law in the passages surveyed above and Matthew's representation of Jesus as a teacher of the Law in 12,1-14. In both authors we find a form of legal interpretation that entails drawing analogies between the treatment of animals and the treatment of people by means of a *minori ad maius* argumentation grounded in a commitment to mercy and related moral values ⁵⁸. While Philo interprets laws about the treat-

⁵⁴ C. DEUTSCH, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke*. Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30 (JSNTSup 18; Sheffield 1987) 41-43; Cf. LUZ, *Matthew*, II, 172.

⁵⁵ Pss 68,17; 99,5; 105,1; 106,1; 108,21; Jer 40,11; Wis 15,1. Cf. *Pss. Sol.* 2.36; 5.12; PHILO, *Spec.* 3.116.

⁵⁶ Note the verbal links: 11,28 (πεφορτισμένοι); 23,4 (φορτία βαρέα); 23,23 (τὰ βαρύτερα). Cf. H.-J. BECKER, *Auf der Kathedra des Moses*. Rabbinisch-theologisches Denken und antirabbinische Polemik in Matthäus 23, 1-12 (ANTZ 4; Berlin 1990) 145-161; R. BEATON, *Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel* (SNTSMS 123; Cambridge 2002) 164-172.

⁵⁷ YANG, *Sabbath*, 159-161; R.K. MCIVER, "The Sabbath in the Gospel of Matthew", *AUSS* 2 (1995) 235; D. VERSEPUT, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King*. A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12 (EUS 291; Frankfurt am Main 1986) 132, 153-155.

⁵⁸ Comparison also indicates variations in how such argumentation could be communicated verbally. For his part, Matthew prefers constructions with διαφέρειν (see below), while Philo employs constructions with πόρρωθεν, μακρόθεν, μᾶλλον, τὸ πλεον, or περισσους. Also noteworthy in this regard is the use of rhetorical questions. Besides Matt 6,26; 11,11, see PHILO, *QE* 2.12; *Spec.* 2.89; *Hum.* 133; PLUTARCH, *Esu carn.* 996A.

ment of animals in terms of their implications for the treatment of people, Matthew addresses a legal question about the treatment of people with an illustration about the treatment of animals. In each case there is a presupposition that human beings not only have an obligation to extend mercy to animals, but also that this obligation constitutes a basis for reflecting on the obligations that human beings have to one another. While both authors tether their analogical arguments to the concepts of ἔλεος and χρηστός, the frameworks within which they do so differ significantly. For his part, Philo relates the concepts to the principle of φιλανθρωπία. In the First Gospel, on the other hand, the concept of mercy (12,7) is probably best construed as an extension of the love command (cf. 5,7.43-46)⁵⁹, while the concept of kindness (11,30) is probably best understood at least partly as a manifestation of Jesus' humility (11,29)⁶⁰.

Further differences can be discerned when we take into account the dynamics of the two authors' respective socio-rhetorical circumstances. While Philo's basic purpose in writing is overtly apologetic, the arguments in Matt 12,5-7 and 12,11-12 contribute to an agenda that can be described as sectarian in nature, that is, they serve to differentiate Jesus from his Pharisaic opponents with respect to a core aspect of Jewish identity. As Anthony Saldarini notes, during the Second Temple period the rhetoric of sectarian legitimation and differentiation often surfaced in debates about the correct interpretation of the Law⁶¹. By the same token, comparison with texts from Plutarch, Porphyry, and Iamblichus suggests that the sort of analogy being drawn in Matt 12,11 (including the logic informing Jesus'

⁵⁹ DAVIES – ALLISON, *Saint Matthew*, II, 321; LUZ, *Matthew*, II, 187-188. The duty of mercy for all living things in *T. Zeb.* 5.1 may be based on the command to love one's neighbor (Lev 19,18), as suggested by R. BAUCKHAM, "Jesus and Animals I: What Did He Teach?", *Animals on the Agenda. Questions about Animals for Theology and Ethics* (eds. A. LINZEY – D. YAMAMOTO) (Urbana, IL 1998) 34.

⁶⁰ The themes of withdrawal and humility in 12,15-21 (the passage that immediately follows the pair of controversy stories about Sabbath observance) recall 11,28-30, as noted by FRANKEMÖLLE, *Matthäus*, II, 141; LAANSMA, *Rest*, 210; J. GNILKA, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (HTKNT 1/1-2; Freiburg 1986) I, 453.

⁶¹ SALDARINI, *Community*, 100-134. Cf. D.C. SIM, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism. The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community* (Edinburgh 1998) 115-150.

basic argument) would not have been inconsistent with efforts to make Jesus' moral teachings intelligible to non-Jewish audiences as well. As Ulrich Luz has suggested, although Matthew's Gospel most likely originated in a Jewish Christian milieu, among the evangelist's emerging priorities is the mission to the Gentiles, a task that would have entailed the "adaptation" of the community's legal traditions to an expanding and increasingly pluralistic audience⁶². In this regard, it is significant that in Matt 12,11 the merciful treatment of an animal is presented not as a dictate of the Mosaic law (as was the case in the examples from Philo discussed above) but as a self-evident matter of common experience and practice.

Such considerations provide a vantage point from which to reflect on the importance attached to the teaching/learning process in Matthew's interpretation of the Law, an emphasis shared by Philo. As we have seen, in the Exposition, the Alexandrian repeatedly draws attention to how through the Law Moses educates its adherents in virtue, honing their moral dispositions in particular ways. The appeal to "learn from me" in Matt 11,29, meanwhile, reflects a narrative priority for the First Gospel as a whole, namely, the portrayal of Jesus as one who teaches and his followers as ones who learn⁶³. In concert with this, it is apparent that for both authors what is at stake for their readers is learning not simply the correct observance of particular laws, but also how to reason about the relevance of the Law in determining human responsibilities more broadly. In the case of Matthew, the principles supporting this form of reasoning are summed up under the related concepts of mercy (12,7) and "doing good" (12,12)⁶⁴, principles exemplified by who Jesus is (11,29), what Jesus says (12,7.12) and what Jesus does (12,13). The need for such reasoning abilities is essential, since, as R. T. France observes, the conclusion in Matt 12,12b (lacking the second set of alternatives in Mark 3,4) not only "goes far beyond the specific

⁶² LUZ, *Matthew*, I, 50-52. Cf. P. FOSTER, *Community, Law and Mission in Matthew's Gospel* (WUNT 2/177; Tübingen 2004) 253-260.

⁶³ U. LUZ, *Studies in Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI 2005) 115-142. The term διδάσκαλος informs Jesus' self-presentation in 10,24-25 and 23,8. Note also the use of διδάσκειν in 4,23; 5,2; 7,29; 9,35; 11,1; 13,54; 21,23; 22,16; 26,55; 28,20 (cf. 7,28; 22,33).

⁶⁴ For the connection between mercy and "doing good", see Mic 6,8; Sir 2,9; Acts 9,36; cf. *T. Zeb.* 7.2.

issue under discussion” but “[a]s a guide to Sabbath observance could result in widely divergent practice”. Therefore, not unlike the Golden Rule (7,12), the principles illustrated in 12,7.12 leave each individual a fair amount of discretion to determine what the criterion of doing “good” requires in a given situation ⁶⁵. What is being illustrated, then, is both an interpretation of practice as well as a way of reasoning about practice in general. As Repschinski puts it, in this passage “Matthew makes Jesus the teacher of the Law”, who not only “can expose the Pharisaic teaching as illogical and hypocritical”, but also “propose an interpretation of the Law that is better argued and more humanely applied”, thereby showing “the way to the greater righteousness (5:17)” ⁶⁶.

One final area of comparison between the two authors has to do with the role assigned in this teaching/learning process to the animal world. Specifically, it is possible to discern a difference between the two with respect to assumptions that they make about the basic nature of animals and their status in the order of creation. One way to gain some insight in this regard is by comparing Matt 12,12a with similarly worded passages elsewhere in the Gospel.

Look at the birds of the air, that they do not sow, nor reap, nor gather into barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not worth much more (μᾶλλον διαφέρετε) than they? (Matt 6,26)

Are not two sparrows sold for a cent? And yet not one (εἷν) of them will fall to the ground apart from your Father ... So do not fear; you are more valuable (διαφέρετε) than many sparrows. (Matt 10,29-31)

How much more valuable (πόσω ... διαφέρει) is a human being than a sheep. (Matt 12,12a)

Matt 10,29-31 (cf. Luke 12,6-7) envisions a scenario in which a sparrow is brought down by the hunter’s snare and subsequently sold in the marketplace (cf. Amos 3,5; *Gen. Rab.* 79.6). This, says Jesus, is something that does not happen ἄνευ τοῦ πατρός, that is, apart from divine knowledge and consent (cf. Job 38,41; Ps 147,9). Here, as in Matt 6,26 (cf. Luke 12,24), Jesus’ comments are meant

⁶⁵ R.T. FRANCE, *The Gospel of Matthew* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 465.

⁶⁶ REPSCHINSKI, *Controversy Stories*, 115.

to assure the audience of God's pervasive care. While a certain pre-eminence for humanity within the order of creation is clearly presupposed in this regard, there is no evidence to suggest that Matthew would have endorsed the Stoic-Philonic view summarized earlier, according to which animals exist solely to serve people because (lacking rationality) they are categorically unlike people⁶⁷. Put differently, although the statements in Matt 6,26, 10,29-31, and 12,12 are couched in arguments *a minori ad maius*, they do not have the effect of setting human beings on a different plane of existence *vis-à-vis* non-human beings. Instead, attention is drawn to the mutuality of people and animals as members of creation, which, as such, are united in their dependence on God's provision, which extends even to individual members of each species⁶⁸. Accordingly, insofar as God is Lord of all creation and not of humankind alone, all spheres of human action are not only morally meaningful but also morally related⁶⁹.



With regard to its content, scholarship on Matt 12,11-12 has focused on parallels with synoptic co-texts (e.g., Mark 3,4) and with early Jewish texts on the sabbatical treatment of animals (e.g., CD 11.13-14). With regard to its manner of reasoning, scholarship on the passage has focused on parallels with rabbinic literature, to the neglect of evidence supplied by non-rabbinic authors. For an example of the latter we can turn to Philo and his Exposition of the Law. Like Matthew, the Alexandrian constructs arguments incorporating *a minori ad maius* comparisons between human and non-human subjects as a way of both indicating the correct observance of specific laws and illustrating forms of moral reasoning predicated on the observance of mercy and similar virtues. With both authors it is possible to discern a process according to which the obligation to treat animals mercifully constitutes a basis for reflect-

⁶⁷ It should be noted that the rabbis were not immune to Stoic theories of teleological anthropocentrism, as evidenced by *m. Qidd.* 4.14.

⁶⁸ The "one" sparrow of 10,29 can be compared with the "one" sheep of 12,11. See n. 16 above. Cf. R. BAUCKHAM, "Jesus and Animals", 39-48.

⁶⁹ DAVIES – ALLISON, *Saint Matthew*, I, 649.

ing more broadly on the responsibilities that human beings have to one another. While Philo interprets laws about the treatment of animals in terms of their implications for the treatment of people, Matthew addresses a legal question about the treatment of people with an illustration about the treatment of animals. For the latter, the merciful treatment of animals is presented not as a stipulation of the Law but as a matter of convention. In this regard it is similar to texts such as Plutarch, *Cato* 5.5, where the practice of extending kindness to animals is presented as a type of training in humanity that contributes to the moral formation of its observers.

Candler School of Theology
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322
U.S.A.

Walter T. WILSON

SUMMARY

After comparing Matt 12,11-12 with its synoptic parallels (Mark 3,4; Luke 13,15-16; 14,5) and with texts that discuss the treatment of animals on the Sabbath (e.g., CD 11.13-14), the passage is compared with Philonic texts (*Spec.* 2.89; 4.218; *Virt.* 81, 133, 139-140, 160; cf. Plutarch, *Cato* 5.5; *Esu carn.* 996A; Iamblichus, *Vit. Pythag.* 30.186; Porphyry, *Abst.* 3.26.6) in which the Alexandrian discerns a principle informing a law that refers to the treatment of animals, and then suggests that the principle applies by analogy to the treatment of people, illuminating the principle with reference to mercy and similar concepts.

Is the Subject of τετέλεσται in John 19,30 “It” or “All Things” ?

The traditional translation of Jesus' last words from the cross in John's Gospel is “It is finished” (τετέλεσται) ¹. However, some translators ² and commentators ³ contend that the subject “all things” (πάντα) should be supplied from John 19,28 so that the sense of John 19,30 should be “all things are finished”. Although a few scholars have held the latter position, to date there has been

¹ The translation “it” is the most commonly suggested subject of τετέλεσται in English Bibles (e.g., *TCB*, 1535; *PNT*, 1595; *GNV*, 1599; *KJV*, 1611; *NKJV*, 1982; *NJB*, 1985; *NRSV*, 1989; *NLT*, 1996; *ESV*, 2001; *ERV*, 2006; *NABRE*, 2010; *NIV*, 2011). This translation also appears in most of the ancient versions (e.g., Vulgate and Peshitta) and in many Bibles in Italian (e.g., *Martini* 1771; *LND* 1991; *NR* 1994, 2006; *CEI* 2008), Spanish (e.g., *RV* 1960, 1977, 1995; *LBLA* 1997), French (e.g., *FBJ* 1973), and German (e.g., *LUT* 1545; *SCH* 1951; *SCL* 2000; *EIN* 1980).

² The translation “all” is attested in the Diatessaron and derivative literature; see T. BAARDA, *Early Transmission of the Words of Jesus*. Thomas, Tatian, and the Text of the New Testament (Amsterdam 1983) 69-72. This rendering is also attested in one Latin text (manuscript *n* of St. Gall) and in several Bibles in French (e.g., *La Bible de Genève*, 1669; *La Bible Martin*, 1744; *Sainte Bible contenant l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament*, 1759; *LSG*, 1910; *TOB*, 1975-76; *NEG*, 1979; *BDS*, 1992, 1999; *FRC*, 1997), Italian (e.g., *GDB*, 1649; *CEI*, 1974; *BDG*, 2006), Spanish (e.g., *PER*, 1993; *DHH*, 1996; *NVI*, 1999; *NVI*, 2005; *BLP*, 2010; *BLPH*, 2010; *NTV*, 2010; *PDT*, 2012), German (e.g., *GNB*, 1982), and English (e.g., *BBE*, 1941; *TCNT*, 1904, and *OEB* that is based upon it).

³ A. PLUMMER, *Gospel According to St John* (CGTSC; Cambridge, MA 1905), 331; J.H. BERNARD, *St. John* (ICC; New York 1929) II, 639; X. LÉON-DUFOUR, *Life and Death in the New Testament*. The Teaching of Jesus and Paul (San Francisco, CA 1986) 133; J. GNILKA, *Johannesevangelium* (Würzburg 1983) 145. This view appears to be supported as well by J.A. BENIGEL, *Gnomon of the New Testament* (Philadelphia, PA 1860) II, 483. This view is also taken by Gennadius Scholarius (c. 1400 - c.1473 CE) who summarized Jesus' last words from the cross as Λέγει τοίνυν οὕτω πρὸς τὸν θεόν· θεέ μου θεέ μου πάντα πεπληρώται ἤδη τὸ ἐκπνεῦσαι μόνον λοιπὸν ἔστιν; *Responsiones aliquarum quaestionum in scripturam sacram* 1.113, M. JUGIE – L. PETIT – X.A. SIDERIDES (eds.), *Œuvres complètes de Georges (Gennadios) Scholarios* (Paris 1930) 317.

only one systematic defense of this view ⁴. Therefore, this paper will attempt to demonstrate (1) that the unexpressed subject of τετέλεσται in John 19,30 is “all things” (πάντα) rather than “it” with the subject being supplied from the phrase πάντα τετέλεσται just a few lines earlier in the passage (John 19,28) and (2) that the traditional interpretations of “it” as the subject of τετέλεσται in John 19,30 (e.g., the fulfillment of Messianic prophecies; the work that the Father sent Jesus to complete) do not fit well with the overall message and structure of John. In brief, the initial section of this study will demonstrate the plausibility of the translation “all things”, while the concluding section will explain why this translation makes the best sense from a hermeneutical standpoint.

I. Why “All Things” is the Most Likely Subject in John 19,30

1. Syntactical, Contextual, and Morphological Arguments

In John 19,30, τετέλεσται lacks an expressed subject. Normally, the nominative of a third person verb may be omitted when (1) it is expressed or implied by the context; (2) it is indefinite or impersonal (e.g., ἦν ... πρῶτῃ, John 18,28); (3) it is a general statement (e.g., ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, Matt 5,11); (4) the verb implies its own subject (e.g., σαλπίσει, “the trumpet will trumpet”, 1 Cor 15,52); or (5) the verb describes meteorological phenomena (e.g., βρέχει, Jas 5,17) ⁵. Of these options, only examples one or two could apply in John 19,30.

The generic “it” (example two) could serve as the subject of τετέλεσται in 19,30, as the majority of translators and biblical scholars would have it. The arguments that commend “it” as the subject are that the verb is singular in form, thus suggesting a singular subject, and that the verb is without an expressed subject in

⁴ R.H. GUNDY, “New Wine in Old Wineskins: Bursting Traditional Interpretations in John’s Gospel (Part Two)”, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 17 (2007) 292-294.

⁵ W.W. GOODWIN, *A Greek Grammar* (Boston, MA 1892) 896; H.W. SMYTH, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, MA 1956) 931-932; F. BLASS – A. DEBRUNNER – W. FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge, MA 1961) 129-130.

its clause, thus suggesting that “it” should fill this role by default. Neither of these points is particularly strong. The singular verb does not necessarily imply a singular subject since John commonly pairs neuter plural subjects with singular verbs ⁶. Furthermore, the subject of τετέλεσται in 19,30 may have been unexpressed because it was implied by the context (example one) of the pericope (19,28-30), where the exact same form of this verb was employed earlier in 19,28 with an expressed subject (πάντα τετέλεσται). This latter view has more to commend it than is commonly acknowledged.

One might object that if the author of John had intended for “all things” to serve as the subject of both occurrences of τετέλεσται in this passage, he would have simply repeated the phrase in John 19,30. Yet, there are several compelling reasons for thinking he intended “all things” to serve as the implied subject of the second occurrence of the verb as well. First, τελέω appears only twice in the entire Gospel of John (19,28.30), thereby increasing the odds that these words are closely related (an argument from the frequency of occurrence). Second, these two occurrences of τελέω are identical in form ⁷, once again suggesting a close connection between them and lending weight to the proposal that they share the same subject (an argument from morphology). As Plummer asserts concerning the verb in 19,28, “The identity between τετέλεσται here and in John 19:30 must be preserved in translation; are now finished” ⁸. Gundry concurs: “Insofar as the second τετέλεσται echoes the first one, then, we should translate the second, ‘they are finished’, not ‘it is finished’. In this translation ‘they’ harks back to πάντα, ‘all’ [...]. In summary, τετέλεσται in 19:30 means ‘they are finished’ in an echo of ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ‘all are now finished,’ in 19:28” ⁹. Third, an author would be unlikely to change the subject of identical verbs that appear in such close proximity without giving his reader a clear indication of such a shift (an argument from uniformity of subject). Fourth, these two verbs appear in the same pericope only

⁶ GUNDRY, “New Wine”, 292-293, lists several examples of this practice (e.g. John 1,3.28; 3,9.19.20.21.23; 5,36; 6,23.63; 7,8; 9,3; 10,3.4.12.16.21.22.25.41; 12,16; 15,7; 16,15; 17,10; 19,28.31.36; 20,30; 21,25).

⁷ Both instances of τετέλεσται are perfect passive indicative third person singular verbs.

⁸ PLUMMER, *St John*, 331.

⁹ GUNDRY, “New Wine”, 292, 296.

a few verses apart (John 19,28.30), thereby increasing the likelihood that the author intended the first subject to be resupplied at the second occurrence of the verb (an argument from proximity).

The argument from proximity is strengthened even further if John 19,28b-29 is regarded as a parenthetical statement¹⁰. The following arrangement of verses indents this material, encloses the potentially parenthetical section, and emphasizes the two occurrences of the verb τελέω:

²⁸ Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται,
(ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει· διψῶ. ²⁹ σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους
μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστόν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσώπῳ περιθέντες
προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι)

³⁰ ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβεν τὸ ὄξος [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τετέλεσται, καὶ
κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.

This arrangement of the passage reveals the purpose of the second occurrence of τετέλεσται: it is resumptive in nature, picking up again the original thread of thought from 19,28a after the brief excursus in which Jesus drank the vinegar and fulfilled prophecy.

Hubbard proposed yet another solution to account for the absence of the subject in 19,30 which appears to be a hybrid of the two views presented above. He argues that the subject of τετέλεσται is left unstated for theological reasons rather than for syntactical ones. He writes:

All things, indeed, is so all-embracing a term that it needs no parallel in the final cry. “It is finished” stands by itself with no stated subject and means that the total task set by the Father, with all its ramifications, has been so thoroughly accomplished by Jesus’ absolute faithfulness that nothing is left undone. It means more even than that. It not only looks back to what Jesus has achieved, it also looks forward, as the perfect tense in Greek can do, to what will yet be achieved. Jesus dies not only because he has done the Father’s will,

¹⁰ Several scholars have noted that τετέλεσται brackets the statement concerning Jesus’ thirst. See R.E. BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah* (ABRL; New York, NY 1994) II, 1071, 1077; R.L. BRAWLEY, “An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28-29” *JBL* 112 (1993) 427; L.TH. WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst in John 19:28-30: Literal or Figurative?” *JBL* 115 (1996) 493; C.S. KEENER, *The Gospel of John. A Commentary* (Peabody, MA 2003) II, 1445.

but also because for him to die is itself the Father's will, the crowning act of a life of splendid glory (1:14; 17:22, 24), the opening of the path to life and discipleship for all who believe in his name ¹¹.

It appears that, for Hubbard, the events comprising "all things" have been consolidated so that they may be described with a singular "it". This differs from the first theory presented above in which the indefinite "it" in 19,30 is not usually regarded as the same subject as "all things" in 19,28. In Hubbard's interpretation, the subject of 19,28, although shifted from plural to singular, remains essentially the same as that of 19,30. Although the current article will argue in the next section that the subject was probably omitted merely to avoid redundancy, Hubbard's proposal certainly deserves due consideration and, in the end, still upholds the notion that "all things" is in some way incorporated into and related to the subject of τετέλεσται in 19,30.

2. Arguments from Johannine Style

The primary argument of this essay is that the author of John abridged the phrase πάντα τετέλεσται in 19,28 to τετέλεσται in 19,30 rather than repeating it in full. The practice of abbreviation is consistent with the general stylistic tendencies displayed by the Fourth Gospel. The author often avoids the repetition of unnecessary words through the techniques of ellipsis ¹², brachylogy (e.g., 1,22; 9,36), aposiopesis (6,62), and abbreviating lengthy statements when they are repeated in the narrative ¹³. The author elsewhere expected his reader to perform such simple tasks as supplying a subject or a verb from an earlier clause ¹⁴ or verse. For instance, in the

¹¹ D.A. HUBBARD, "John 19:17-30", *Int* 43 (1989) 401.

¹² The author sometimes omits the subject and verb (18,5.7; he omits λέγω, a verb with an embedded subject, from the οὐχ ὅτι in 6,46 and 7,22) or the verb alone (13,9.18; 15,4.5.25). He sometimes employs ellipsis in the context of questions (4,26; 12,28).

¹³ Jesus' announcement πορεύου, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ (John 4,50) is reduced to ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ (4,53). The command ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει (5,8) is reduced to ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει (5,11). The statement αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει (9,21) is summarized as: ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε (9,23).

¹⁴ The reader must supply a verb in John 15,5: "I am the vine, you *are* the branches" (ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα); the reader must supply

phrase ἀλλ’ ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός (1,8), the reader must supply the verb ἦλθεν (and its embedded subject) from 1,7. Likewise, in the phrase ἀλλ’ ἵνα φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ (9,3), the reader is to supply “he was born blind” from 9,2. Thus, for him to abbreviate a clause and expect the reader to transfer the subject “all things” from τετέλεσται in 19,28 to the identical verb form in 19,30 would not be a departure from his standard practice.

This essay also assumes that Jesus’ knowledge that “all things are finished” (19,28) was eventually expressed by the phrase τετέλεσται (19,30). This practice is consistent with the author’s portrayal of Jesus knowing something shortly before he announced it:

| <i>Knowing</i> | <i>Saying</i> | <i>Passage</i> |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| γινούς | λέγει | John 5,6 |
| ἦδαι | ἔλεγεν | John 6,6 |
| εἰδώς | εἶπεν | John 6,61 |
| ἦδαι | (no verb of saying) | John 6,64 |
| ἦδαι | εἶπεν | John 13,10-11 |
| ἔγνω | εἶπεν | John 16,19 |
| εἰδώς | λέγει | John 18,4 |
| εἰδώς | εἶπεν | John 19,28,30 |

This position is strengthened further in John 19,30 if Gundry is correct in his classification of οὖν as an inferential conjunction. “Confirming this translation is the postpositive οὖν toward the beginning of v. 30: ‘therefore, when he had received the wine vinegar Jesus said τετέλεσται’. The illative (οὖν) indicates that Jesus said τετέλεσται (v. 30) because he knew that ‘all things are now finished’ (v. 28)”¹⁵. This evidence confirms what numerous scholars have already argued: τετέλεσται in 19,30 was simply expressing in words what Jesus had already known in his heart in 19,28¹⁶. If

both πάντα and the verb in 17,10: “and all that is mine is yours and *all that is yours is mine*” (καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστίν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ).

¹⁵ GUNDRY, “New Wine”, 292. For a detailed analysis of the use of οὖν in John, see P. ELLINGWORTH, “Translating *Oun* in John’s Gospel”, *BT* 51 (2000) 135-143.

¹⁶ BENDEL, *Gnomon*, II, 483, commented on τετέλεσται in John 19,30: “This word was in the heart of Jesus in ver. 28: it is now put forth by word of mouth”; J.P. LANGE *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*. Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical (Grand Rapids, MI 1976) III, 687 writes, “It is finished.—

this interpretation is correct, then the subject of the verb in both cases is more likely “all things”.

II. Potential Meanings of “It” or “All Things” in John 19,30

1. *The Meaning of “It” or “All Things” in the Scholarly Literature*

Since so many theories have been proposed for the meaning of “it” or “all things” in John 19,30, only a brief survey of the more commonly accepted and more likely views is possible in a paper of this length. The primary possibilities for the meaning of “it” (or in some cases “all things”) that have emerged from the literature are as follows: (1) the work that the Father sent Jesus to complete¹⁷; (2) the fulfillment of the whole range of Messianic prophecies¹⁸; (3) the fulfillment of the single prophecy, “I thirst”¹⁹; (4) the love that Christ had for his disciples (John 13,1) that was fulfilled on the cross²⁰; (5) the combination of Jesus’ works, signs, and words²¹; (6) the

Τετέλεσται. The expression of the consciousness, ver. 28”; PLUMMER, *St John*, 332, comments on 19,30: “Τετέλεσται. Just as the thirst was there before he expressed it, so the consciousness that His work was finished was there (John 19:28) before He declared it”; BERNARD, *St. John*, II, 639: “He cried Τετέλεσται, that all might know that great fact of which He was Himself assured, ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται”; G. DELLING, “τέλος, τελέω”, *TDNT* (Grand Rapids, MI 1983) VIII, 59; J.R. MICHAELS, *John* (Understanding the Bible Commentary Series; Grand Rapids, MI 2011), 328; G.M. BURGE, *John* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids, MI 2000) 529.

¹⁷ G. DALMON, *Jesus – Jeshua*. Studies in the Gospels (New York 1971) 218; PLUMMER, *St John*, 332; C.H. DODD, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (London 1963) 69, n. 2; 124; G. BAMPFYLDE, “John xix 28: A Case for a different translation”, *NovT* 11 (1969) 250; HUBBARD, “John 19:17-30”, 401; D.M. SMITH, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; New York 2005) 43; KEENER, *John*, II, 1148, seems to favor this view, but also mentions other options.

¹⁸ R.E. BROWN, *The Gospel of John (xiii-xxi)*. Introduction, Translation and Notes (AB 29A; Garden City, NY 1970) II, 929; *The Death of the Messiah*, II, 1078; F.J. MOLONEY, “The Gospel of John: The ‘End’ of Scripture”, *Int* 63 (2009) 356-366.

¹⁹ J. CHRYSOSTOM, *Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew*, 14.319.

²⁰ E. HAENCHEN, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chapters 7–21* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1984) II, 194.

²¹ GUNDRY, “New Wine”, 292-294.

atoning death of Christ ²²; (7) the events of the entire passion narrative ²³; (8) the completion of the works that will lead to a renewed creation ²⁴; and, (9) the completion of the Passover meal when Jesus consumed the “fourth cup” on the cross ²⁵.

Some scholars combine several of the items from the list above so that “it” refers to Jesus’ work and atonement ²⁶, his work and the fulfillment of Scripture ²⁷, his words and works ²⁸, or even his work, the atonement, and the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy ²⁹. In one instance, the singular “it” supposedly refers to as many as seven items ³⁰. The existence of so many theories as to the exact meaning

²² J. CALVIN, *John*, II, 235; BERNARD, *St. John*, II, 639; L. MORRIS, “The Atonement in John’s Gospel” *CTR* 2 (1988), 50; C.L. BLOMBERG, *The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel*. Issues and Commentary (Downers Grove, IL 2001) 253; R.V.G. TASKER, *The Gospel According to St. John* (TNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 211; DELLING, “τέλος”, VIII, 59; T. ODEN, *The Word of Life, Systematic Theology* (Peabody, MA 2001) II, 320.

²³ EPHRAIM, “On Our Lord”, 321; A. EDERSHEIM, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (Grand Rapids, MI 1984) II, 608-609; BERNARD, *St. John*, II, 638.

²⁴ N.T. WRIGHT, *The Challenge of Jesus*. Rediscovering Who Jesus Was and Is (Downers Grove, IL 1999) 175-176; J.K. BROWN, “Creation’s Renewal in the Gospel of John”, *CBQ* 72 (2010) 275-290.

²⁵ S. HAHN, *A Father Who Keeps His Promises*. God’s Covenant Love in Scripture (Cincinnati, OH 1998) 225-244; B. PITRE, *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist*. Unlocking the Secrets of the Last Supper (New York 2011) 147-170. This theory argues that Jesus reserved the fourth cup of the Passover meal for the moment of his death on the cross when he drank and said, “It is finished”. Although such a theory might be possible if the four canonical gospels were allowed in the reconstruction, this view is implausible from the perspective of Johannine theology alone, especially since John does not mention the Passover cups in his brief account of the Last Supper (John 13,1-4).

²⁶ F.F. BRUCE, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1983) 374; G.R. BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John* (WBC 36; Waco, TX 1987) 351, 356. Cf. O. CULLMAN, “Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums” *TZ* 4 (1948) 370.

²⁷ BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, II, 1078; also, LÉON-DAUFOUR, *Life and Death*, 134; C.K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St John* (London 1955) 459-460; WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 495, 496, and 502; BENGEL, *Gnomon*, 483.

²⁸ BAMPFYLDE, “John xix 28”, 250.

²⁹ A. BARNES, *Notes on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI 1976) 372; B.F. WESTCOTT, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1971) 277-278.

³⁰ C.H. SPURGEON, *Christ’s Words From the Cross* (Grand Rapids, MI 1965) 86-104.

of “it” or “all things” demonstrates the lack of a suitable methodology for determining the most likely candidate. Therefore, the following section will seek to cull out the least probable of the interpretations listed above.

Proponents of the view that “it” refers to the work the Father sent Jesus to complete often base their argument on the evidence that τελέω and τελειόω are from the same word group, that the latter verb appears in passages related to the “work” of the Father (John 4,34; 5,36; 17,4)³¹, and that, by extension, τελέω itself is related to the Father’s work. Although this interpretation is frequently cited, it can be challenged because τελέω is used only twice in John (19,28.30), which suggests that this verb has a specialized usage that distinguishes it somewhat from that of τελειόω³². Thus, it may not follow that a connection between the Father’s work and τελειόω entails a relationship between the Father’s work and τελέω. Moreover, the words τελέω and “work” (or “works”) never appear together in John. Furthermore, the “work” of the Father, which is often connected to τελειόω (John 4,34; 5,36; 17,4), may not always refer to Jesus’ overall mission, thereby calling into question the proposal that “it is finished” refers to the whole work of Christ, even if a connection between τελειόω and τελέω were established. The “works” of the Father mentioned in John 5,36 appear to refer to Jesus’ miracles alone and not to the overall agenda of the Father. Although many believe that the “works” in 17,4 refer to Jesus’ whole mission, including his sacrificial death³³, the more

³¹ LANGE, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, III, 587; M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Évangile selon saint Jean* (EB; Paris, 1925) 497; F.J. MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina 4; Collegeville, MN 1998) 504; R. SCHIPPERS, “Τέλος”, *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI 1976) II, 64; A.J. KÖSTENBERGER, *John* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI 2004) 551, lists 4,34 and 17,4; TASKER, *The Gospel According to John*, 211; F. PACK, *The Gospel According to John* (LWC; Austin, TX 1977) II, 141; D.W. BAUR, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen 1925) 218; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel According to St. John* (HTCNT; New York 1982) III, 282-285; HUBBARD, “John 19:17-30”, 401; GNILKA, *Johannesevangelium*, 145.

³² BAMPFYLDE, “John XIX 28”, 249-250.

³³ BROWN, *John*, II, 742; L. MORRIS, *The Gospel According to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1984) 721, n. 19; BRUCE, *The Gospel of John*, 330; D.A. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids, MI 1991) 557; BURGE, *John*, 463-464.

natural reading of the passage is that his work of preparing the disciples (17,6-8) is distinguished from the work of the cross (the “hour”) that was yet to be accomplished and the return to glory (17,1). Moloney describes these two phases well:

The fundamental orientation of the life of Jesus was to complete the task given him by the Father (cf. 4:34; 5:36). Jesus tells the Father that this has now been accomplished (v. 4), and because of that a decisive turning point in Jesus’ story has been reached (v. 5a; *kai nun*). The revelation of God in and through the words and action of Jesus is complete (v. 5b), and thus Jesus can ask the Father to glorify him (*nun doxason me*) by restoring him to the Father’s presence with the glory that was his before the world was made ... But this can only happen through the “hour” of the “lifting up”, that the glory of God may be revealed and the Son may be glorified ... This “hour” has come (v. 1 *elēluthen hē hōra*). Crossing the threshold into his “hour”, Jesus looks back across his life and ministry. He is able to point to the people at table with him as proof of the claim that he has brought to perfection the task the Father gave him (vv. 6-8; cf. v. 4) ...³⁴

Finally, the “work” of the Father in 4,34 seems to be closely linked to the labors of gathering in the Samaritan harvest (4,35-38). Of the three passages treated here, the latter comes closest to giving an overall description of the mission of Jesus. Nevertheless, the connection between the overall mission of Jesus and τελειόω in John is not so firm as some of the advocates of this position have claimed.

Another common interpretation is that “it” refers to the fulfillment of the whole range of Messianic prophecies. In favor of this view, τελέω is employed in Luke-Acts for the fulfillment of Messianic prophecies that are related to the passion narrative³⁵. Also,

³⁴ MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John*, 461. For others who see a transition from one stage of Jesus’ mission to another in 17,4, see B. LINDARS, *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; Grand Rapids, MI 1972) 520; MICHAELS, *John*, 293-294. In contrast to this view, CARSON, *Gospel of John*, 557, distinguishes between the glory on earth (17,4; including the cross) and the future glory of Christ in heaven (17,5). However, the request that the Father glorify the Son in 17,5 echoes that of 17,1 which also refers to the “hour.” Thus, the work of the cross appears to be a part of the future glory (17,5) and distinguished from the glory of the past (17,4).

³⁵ Luke 18,31b (καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), 22,37a (λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ

the purported synonymy of τελέω and τελειόω³⁶, coupled with the use of τελειόω for scriptural fulfillment (19,28b), suggests the possibility that τελέω may have been used to indicate the fulfillment of Scripture as well (19,28a.30). Yet, the use of τελέω in John's Gospel for prophetic fulfillment is unlikely for several reasons. (1) Although τελέω and τελειόω are from the same word group, Gundry correctly notes that, "the use of τελειωθῇ with 'the Scripture' rather than the corresponding form of τελέω combines with the exact correspondence between τετέλεσται in v. 30 and the same in v. 28 to disfavor a finishing of Scripture in v. 30"³⁷. (2) The scriptural fulfillment formulae elsewhere in John are τελειωθῇ (19,28)³⁸, πληρωθῇ (12,38; 13,18; 15,25; 17,12; 19,24.28.36; cf. 18,9.32), ὅτι/καθώς + ἐστίν γεγραμμένον (2,17; 6,31; 12,14), and εἶπεν/λέγει (7,38 [καθώς + ἡ γραφή]; 7,42 [ἡ γραφή]; 12,39 [Ἡσαΐας]; 19,37 [γραφή]), so that one of these phrases would have been expected here rather than τετέλεσται if the author had this purpose in mind. (3) The statement that "all things" were completed (i.e. all Messianic predictions) in 19,28 does not comport well with the fulfillment of yet another Scripture while Jesus was still alive (19,28) and of two more after his death (19,36-37). (4) In the majority of instances, John uses the singular "Scripture" (γραφή) to refer to specific passages in the OT and employs the plural "Scriptures" (γραφαί) to refer to the whole corpus of Jewish writings³⁹. If the

γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί); Acts 13,29a (ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα). For a discussion of these and similar passages, see R. BERGMEIER, "ΤΕΤΕΛΕΣΤΑΙ Joh 19:30", *ZNW* 79 (1988) 284-285.

³⁶ BROWN, *John*, II, 908; LINDARS, *Gospel of John*, 580; GUNDRY, "New Wine", 295.

³⁷ GUNDRY, "New Wine", 295.

³⁸ Several manuscripts have πληρωθῇ instead of τελειωθῇ (Ⲙ D^s Θ). P⁶⁶ omits the phrase ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή. If either of these options is correct, the case against τελέω introducing prophecy based on its synonymy with τελειόω would be strengthened, for τελειόω would not appear as a Johannine fulfillment formula at all.

³⁹ The singular γραφή is employed several times with a single passage in mind: John 2,22 (Ps 69,9), 7,38 (Isa 12,3?), 7,42 (Mic 5,2; 2 Sam 7,12?; Ps 89,3.4?), 10,35 (Ps 82,6), 13,18 (Ps 41,9), 17,12 (Ps 41,9; 109,4-8), 19,24 (Ps 22,18), 19,28 (Ps 22,15 or 69,21), 19,36 (Exod 12,46 or Num 9,12), and 19,37 (Zech 12,10). However, the singular γραφή may allude to Scripture as a whole (10,35; 20,9) or to numerous passages related to a single prophetic

author had fulfillment in mind at all, he probably intended a particular Scripture rather than the whole corpus of Messianic prophetic texts, since 19,28 used the singular form of the noun. (5) The use of τελέω for scriptural fulfillment in Luke-Acts is not analogous to that of John. The author of Luke recorded three passion predictions (Luke 9,22.44; 18,31-32), tied Old Testament prophecy to the third of these predictions (18,31), noted several fulfillments of specific prophecies within the passion narrative (22,37; 23,46), and, after the passion, looked back on the prophetic significance of Jesus' suffering (Luke 24,26.44-45; Acts 4,25-26; 8,32-33; 13,29). By way of contrast, John neither prepares his readers to look for such Old Testament prophecies within the passion narrative nor mentions the fulfillment of many specific prophecies within it (19,28.36-37).

Others have proposed that “it is finished” (19,30) refers to the single OT prophecy mentioned in 19,28 (e.g., Ps 42,2; 63,1; 69,21) ⁴⁰. The singular word “Scripture” (γραφή) might support that the author of John had a particular prophetic text in mind, although Gundry raises several valid objections to this theory. The word τελειόω is used to refer to the fulfillment of Scripture, not τελέω, with the result that the latter verb is unlikely to have reference to prophetic fulfillment in this passage. He also notes: “If ‘it’ refers to Scripture, the latter syntax contradicts the immediately preceding statement that all are ‘now’ (ἤδη) finished. For all are not yet completed if the slaking of Jesus’ thirst with wine vinegar remains as unfinished business” ⁴¹.

Robert Gundry promotes the interpretation that “all things” consists of the “works”, “signs”, and “words” of Jesus. As evidence for his view, he notes that these three words sometimes appear with πάντα in other contexts ⁴², are neuter in gender, predominantly appear in the plural, and are, therefore, fitting referents for the neuter plural πάντα in 19,28, which he also regards as the subject of

theme (7,42). The only use of the plural “Scriptures” is a reference to the entire corpus of Jewish writings (5,39). The singular of λόγος in John is also used to refer to a single Scripture: John 12,38 (Isa 53,1); 15,25 (Ps 35,19 or 69,4). See also BRAWLEY, “An Absent Complement”, 434.

⁴⁰ CHRYSOSTOM, *Saint Matthew*, 14.319.

⁴¹ GUNDRY, “New Wine”, 295-296. Also see LANGE, *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, III, 587.

⁴² GUNDRY, 292-293. Πάντα appears with “works” (ἔργα; 5,19-20), “signs” (σημεῖα; 2,23; 4,45), and “words” (ῥήματα; 3,34-35; 14,26; 15,15; 16,15; 17,7-8a. 10).

τετέλεσται in 19,30. Yet, the fulfillment mentioned in 19,28.30 likely does not refer to signs and wonders. The seven major signs in John conclude with the resurrection of Lazarus in chapter 11, which means they were accomplished long before the crucifixion. Furthermore, there is nothing in the immediate context of 19,28.30 to prepare the reader to revisit that particular option ⁴³. Gundry's identification of Jesus' words with "all things" is also fraught with difficulties, for most of Jesus' words in the Fourth Gospel were spoken prior to his suffering, while the words of Jesus during the passion narrative are few. Furthermore, Jesus did not finish all of his words on the cross, for he continued to speak after his resurrection (20,21-23, 29; 21,15-23) and also promised his disciples that he would have more to say through the agency of the Spirit after his ascent to the Father (16,12-13). Since Jesus' signs were accomplished so long before his statement from the cross, his words were not fulfilled on the cross, and the immediate context contains nothing to prepare the reader for the identification of "all things" with either of these two options, Gundry's overall argument fails to convince.

Some scholars connect the words εἰς τέλος ἡγάπησεν αὐτούς (John 13,1) to τετέλεσται (19,30), suggesting that "it is finished" refers to Christ's love for his disciples that was fulfilled upon the cross ⁴⁴. Although this position is often asserted, no one appears to have mounted a thorough defense of it. Nonetheless, this view could be a viable possibility for several reasons. First, the words τέλος, used only once in John, and τελέω are from the same word group so there could be a connection between them. Of course, there must be more to go on than a shared word group, for, as was argued above, τελειόω and τελέω may have different nuances in John. Second, the foot washing scene in which τέλος appears (John 13,1-20) foreshadows the events of the cross, thereby potentially forging a link between these two passages ⁴⁵. Third, the language of John 19,28 (εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... πάντα) may recall that of 13,1

⁴³ If Jesus' resurrection (2,18-22) and the miraculous haul of fish are also signs (21,1-14), the case against GUNDRY would be made even stronger, since this would mean that some of the signs were not "fulfilled" on the cross.

⁴⁴ HAENCHEN, *John*, II, 194; SCHNACKENBURG, *St. John*, III, 16; GUNDRY, "New Wine", 296.

⁴⁵ E.g. BARRETT, *St John*, 363-364; A.J. KÖSTENBERGER, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (BTNT; Grand Rapids, MI 2009), 236.

(εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς) and 13,3 (εἰδὼς ... πάντα)⁴⁶. Fourth, the “hour” that was mentioned in 13,1 (ὅτι ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα) refers, at least in part, to the events of 19,28-30, for, as Barrett asserts, “[t]he hour of Jesus refers to his death on the cross and exaltation in glory”⁴⁷. One objection to this overall view might be that the phrase “it is finished” in 19,30 would then refer to the fulfillment of Jesus’ love for the apostles (13,1) and not for all humanity. However, Jesus’ love shown to the apostles on the cross would not preclude a demonstration of his love for others in the same act. Another objection might be that if the phrase εἰς τέλος does not mean “to the end” (i.e. of Jesus’ life)⁴⁸, but rather means “to the limit” or “fully”⁴⁹, it could refer exclusively to the act of foot washing in chapter 13. Finally, if the argument above is correct that “all things” is the subject of the verb in 19,28 and 19,30, then the singular noun “love” (ἀγάπη) would be an unlikely referent for the plural πάντα⁵⁰. Although this interpretation is possible, it is not very likely.

The three remaining interpretations are the most likely options for the referent of “it” or “all things”. These views are the atoning death of Jesus, the events of the passion narrative as a whole, and that τετέλεσται signifies that Jesus’ death completed the work of God (Gen 2,2-3) prior to his ushering in creation’s renewal. These options fit the context well and will be evaluated in more detail after the presentation of the evidence in the following section.

2. “All Things” as Brackets for the Chiasm of John 18,28 – 19,16

The chiastic structure in the passion narrative of John may provide the key for understanding the function of the words “all things” within this Gospel and help bring more precision to the definition

⁴⁶ BERNARD, *St. John*, II, 454, 585, 637; LINDARS, *Gospel of John*, 580; WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 495.

⁴⁷ BARRETT, *St John*, 159.

⁴⁸ BARNES, *Notes*, 316; BROWN, *John*, II, 550; LINDARS, *Gospel of John*, 448; SCHNACKENBURG, *St. John* III, 16; MOLONEY, *Gospel of John*, 373; KÖSTENBERGER, *John*, 402; KEENER, *John*, II, 899.

⁴⁹ W.K. GROSSOUW, “A Note on Joh 13:1-3”, *NovT* 8 (1966) 128; BEASLEY-MURRAY, *John*, 228, 229, 233; BLASS – DEBRUNNER – FUNK, *A Greek Grammar*, 207.3; DELLING, “τέλος”, VIII, 56.

⁵⁰ The noun ἀγάπη is always singular in John (5,42; 13,35; 15,9.10.13; 17,26).

of this phrase. Scholars have long noted that the trial of Jesus breaks into seven alternating indoor-outdoor scenes⁵¹. These seven scenes also form a chiasm, as Burge's detailed outline, reproduced below, demonstrates⁵²:

STANZA A, 18:28-32 (OUTSIDE PILATE'S CHAMBER)

It was early

Passover

Jewish leaders cannot put a man to death (lawfully)

The type of Jesus' death

A Jewish plea for Jesus' death

STANZA B, 18:33-38A (INSIDE)

Pilate does not speak on his own accord

Jesus' origins: not of this world

Jesus is passive: he is not of this world

STANZA C, 18:38B-40 (OUTSIDE)

Pilate finds no crime in him

Pilate brings Jesus out: he may be set free

STANZA D, 19:1-3 (INSIDE)

1 Jesus flogged

2 Jesus crowned

3 Jesus arrayed in a royal robe

2' Jesus hailed as "king"

1' Jesus struck

STANZA C', 19:4-8 (OUTSIDE)

Pilate finds no crime in Jesus

Pilate brings Jesus out: will he be set free?

STANZA B', 19:9-11 (INSIDE)

Pilate's power is not his own

"Where are you from?"

Jesus is passive: Pilate's authority is from above

STANZA A', 19:12-16 (OUTSIDE)

It was late (the 6th hour)

Passover

The Jewish crowds call for death

Crucifixion⁵³

The Jewish leaders obtain Jesus' death

⁵¹ BROWN, *John*, II, 857-859; B.D. EHRMAN, "Jesus' Trial Before Pilate: John 18:28-19:16", *BTB* 13 (1983) 126-127; C.H. GIBLIN, "John's Narration of the Hearing Before Pilate (John 18,28 – 19,16a)", *Bib* 67 (1986) 221-239.

⁵² BURGE, *John*, 489.

⁵³ This line is odd since the crucifixion does not take place until John 19,17. Perhaps Burge intended for it to be combined with the previous line to say something like, "The Jewish crowds call for death by crucifixion".

This chiasm stands at the heart of the passion narrative, but it neither includes the earlier arrest in the garden nor extends so far as to encompass the climax of the story, the crucifixion itself.

Although a good deal of attention has been given to the literary structure of John 18,28 – 19,16a (i.e. the seven scenes and the chiasm), surprisingly little attention has been paid to the role of the two sections bracketing this chiasm (18,1-27; 19,16b-42) ⁵⁴. A close analysis of these two blocks of material, hereafter designated the Introductory Stanza and the Concluding Stanza, reveals several significant conceptual and verbal correspondences between them:

INTRODUCTORY STANZA, 18,1-27 — OUTSIDE IN A GARDEN / A “PLACE”

Jesus is in a garden (18,1, κήπος)

The garden is identified as a well-known “place” (18,2, τὸν τόπον)

Jesus is arrested by soldiers (18,3)

Jesus knows “all things” that are coming upon him (18,4, Ἰησοῦς [...] εἰδὼς πάντα)

Identification of “Jesus of Nazareth” by soldiers (18,7, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον)

Scripture is fulfilled (18,9, ἵνα πληρωθῇ)

Jesus will drink the cup given by the Father (18,11)

Jesus is taken and bound (18,12, συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτόν)

Peter “stands” at the door (18,16, εἰστήκει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ) near the other disciple (18,15, ἄλλος μαθητής; 18,16, ὁ μαθητής ὁ ἄλλος)

The high priest questions Jesus (18,19, ὁ [...] ἀρχιερεὺς)

CONCLUDING STANZA, 19,16B-42 — OUTSIDE IN A GARDEN / A “PLACE”

Identification of “Jesus of Nazareth” by means of an inscription (19,19, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος)

The high priests question Pilate’s inscription (19,21, οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς)

Jesus is crucified by soldiers (19,23)

Scriptures are fulfilled (19,24, ἵνα [...] πληρωθῇ; 19,36, ἵνα [...] πληρωθῇ)

Mary and the beloved disciple “stand” at the cross (19,25, εἰστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ)

⁵⁴ Much of the discussion of these surrounding sections has focused on the number of episodes or paragraphs within them; e.g. BROWN, *John*, II, 802-803; BEASLEY – MURRAY, *John*, 321.

Jesus knows “all things” are finished (19,28, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς [...]
πάντα)

Jesus drinks the vinegar given by the soldiers (19,28)⁵⁵

Jesus’ body is taken and bound (19,40, ἔλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτό)

Jesus is buried near a garden (19,41, κήπος, καὶ ἐν τῷ κήπῳ).

The garden is near the “place” of crucifixion (19,19, ὁ τόπος; 19,20,
ὁ τόπος)

The Introductory Stanza (18,1-27) and the Concluding Stanza (19,16b-42) are connected by at least ten features: (1) a garden (18,1; 19,41); (2) the word “place” (18,2; 19,19,20); (3) soldiers (18,3; 19,23); (4) the high priest(s) (18,19; 19,21); (5) Jesus’ awareness of “all things” (18,4; 19,28); (6) the title “Jesus of Nazareth” (18,7; 19,19); (7) the fulfillment of Scripture (18,9; 19,24,36); (8) the mention of Jesus’ drinking (18,11; 19,28); (9) the taking and binding of Jesus (18,12; 19,40); and (10) a major character (i.e. Peter or Mary) stands near the beloved (or “other”) disciple (18,15,16; 19,25). These ten correspondences build a sound case that the Introductory Stanza and the Concluding Stanza should be considered a part of the chiasm presented above or, at the very least, a frame for the trial scenes.

A moderate case could be mounted that Burge’s central chiasm (18,28 – 19,16) actually serves the agenda of the Introductory and Concluding sections, for the climax of the story should be the crucifixion, not the trial scenes. Furthermore, the passion narrative consistently develops themes like “king” (18,33,39-40; 19,3,12,14-15,19,21) and “kingdom” (18,33,36-37) through its entirety. For instance, the Introductory Stanza begins with the arrest of “Jesus the Nazarene” (18,5,7), and the trial scenes introduce the title “King of the Jews” (18,33,39; 19,3), but it is only in the Concluding Stanza that the two elements are climactically combined on the *titulus* as “Jesus the Nazarene, King of the Jews” (19,19).

Although the discovery of these additions to the chiasm is significant in its own right, its value for this paper is that it highlights the phrase “all things” (πάντα) at either end of the passion narrative (18,4; 19,28):

⁵⁵ The connection between 18,11 and 19,28 was suggested by WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 502.

Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ’ αὐτόν (18,4)
 Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται (19,28)

The wording of these two passages is remarkably similar; they share the words “knowing” (εἰδὼς), “all things” (πάντα), and “Jesus” (Ἰησοῦς). This close correspondence in the wording and positioning of these two passages at either end of the chiasm strongly suggests that the author intended to link them and that, consequently, “all things” has the same referent in both cases.

The reason for the placement of these similar verses in the Introductory Stanza and Concluding Stanza at either end of the passion narrative is clear: they mark the onset (18,4)⁵⁶ and the conclusion of the passion narrative (19,28)⁵⁷. As Schnackenburg put it, “to Jesus’ knowledge of the future at the beginning of the passion, there corresponds πάντα τετέλεσται (19:28) at its close”⁵⁸. This information suggests that the “all things” that Jesus knew were coming upon him while he was in the garden (18,4) corresponds exactly to the “all things” that were completed just prior to his death (19,28.30). In these passages, “all things” brackets the events of the passion narrative.

If the phrase “all things” in 18,4 and 19,28 has been correctly identified as marking off the boundaries of the passion narrative, then this bit of evidence further confirms the decision to discard several of the theories listed above. “All things” would refer only to events found within the boundary of these two verses and would disallow events that appear outside it or that describe merely a single portion of it. Examples of theories that fall outside the bounds of this section are the “works” and “signs” of Jesus, which were completed long before the passion narrative and do not appear at

⁵⁶ See WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 495: “If in 19:28 we read ‘knowing that all was now completed’ ... what is said first is that Jesus knew that the passion was over. This is clear because of 18:4, where just before Jesus comes out of the garden to be arrested, the narrator says, ‘Jesus, knowing all that was going to happen to him’.”; WESTCOTT, *St. John*, 252, commenting on πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα in John 18,4, states, “The passion has already begun [...] Jesus is omniscient. He knows what is now about to befall him: he knows that the ‘hour’ announced long since has finally struck”; HAENCHEN, *John*, II, 165.

⁵⁷ EPHRAIM, “On Our Lord”, 321; EDERSHEIM, *Life and Times*, II, 608-609; BERNARD, *St. John*, II, 638; WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 495.

⁵⁸ SCHNACKENBURG, *St. John*, III, 223.

all within it, and the “words” of Jesus, which appear prominently at either end of the passion narrative. Likewise, the Messianic prophecies play a minimal role between these two passages; only two are fulfilled within the context of the passion narrative (19,24.28). Theories that are too narrowly focused on particular events within the passion narrative, such as the atoning death of Jesus or the fulfillment of a single prophecy, must also be discarded because several other events also transpired between the parentheses of 18,4 and 19,28.30 (i.e. the arrest, Jewish trial, the interviews with Pilate, scourging, crucifixion, and death). In contrast, concepts that are essentially synonymous with the events of the entire passion narrative are better candidates for the meaning of “all things”, and it is to the examination of these theories that we now turn.

3. *The Relationship between “All Things” and Other Johannine Themes.*

Now that the evidence has been presented that the phrase “all things” functions as a set of bookends for the passion narrative, we will explore the convergence of this phrase with several Johannine themes. The major themes that also appear to overlap with the content and time frame of the passion narrative are Jesus’ “hour”, the “cup”, and the Passover. The relationship of the “new creation” to τετέλεσται in 19,30 will also be examined toward the end of this section.

The connection between the “hour” and “all things” is suggested by the following data. The “hour” meets the criterion of referring to the events of the passion narrative⁵⁹, for it includes such details as the scattering of the disciples (16,32), Jesus’ arrest (7,30; 8,20), his death, and his glorification (12,23; 17,1)⁶⁰. Furthermore, the

⁵⁹ The arrival of the long-anticipated “hour” (2,4; 7,30; 8,20) is actually announced shortly before the passion narrative begins (12,23). The announcement of its arrival is made near the time of Passover (12,1), within the context of Jesus’ anointing for burial (12,7), and after Greeks have asked to see him (12,21; cf. 10,15-16). Since the passion narrative is clearly indicated by the context of 12,23, the mention of the “hour” shortly before the passion technically began should not count against the theme meeting this criterion.

⁶⁰ In the Synoptic Gospels, the “hour” also refers to the suffering and death of Jesus (Matt 26,45; Mark 14,35.41; Luke 22,53). C.E. MORRISON, “The ‘Hour of Distress’, *Targum Neofiti* and the ‘Hour’ in the Gospel of John”, *CBQ* 30 (2008) 590-603, discusses this leitmotif in Jewish texts.

language describing the commencement of the “hour” (13,1), the onset of “all things” coming upon Jesus (18,4), and the completion of “all things” (19,28) is so similar that it suggests a linking of these concepts:

εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα (13,1)
 Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ’ αὐτόν (18,4)
 Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται (19,28)

One feature held in common by these verses is Jesus’ supernatural knowledge of events ⁶¹, a topic raised several times between 13,1 and 19,28 (13,1.3.11.19.21.31; 18,4; 19,28). Finally, just as Judas’ appearance in the garden marks the arrival of the “hour” in the Synoptic Gospels (Mark 14,41; Matt 26,45-46), so his arrival coincides with the statement that Jesus knew “all things” were coming upon him in the Fourth Gospel (18,4). It appears, then, that the “hour” and the narrative that is bound by the parenthetical phrase “all things” (18,4; 19,28) are basically synonymous in time frame and content ⁶².

The theme of the “cup” also shares a significant conceptual overlap with the “the hour” and “all things” since it symbolizes the suffering and death of Jesus, just as it does in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 20,22; Mark 10,38). Although the “cup” is mentioned only once in John (18,11), several scholars have noted a possible later allusion to it when Jesus experienced thirst on the cross (19,28) ⁶³. Perhaps the mentioning of the “cup” in proximity to the first occurrence of “all things” in the Introductory Stanza (18,4) and the mentioning of Jesus’ thirst in proximity to the second occurrence of “all things” in the Concluding Stanza (19,28) are a further indication of the synonymy of these ideas.

The feast of the Passover also coincides with the time frame of the “hour” (John 13,1) ⁶⁴ and “all things” because the passion nar-

⁶¹ SCHNACKENBURG, *St. John* III, 398-399, in commenting on John 13,1, remarks, “This direct ‘knowledge’ that Jesus has continues throughout the passion, from his arrest (18:4) until the last moment on the cross (19:28)”.

⁶² HUBBARD, “John 19:17-30”, 397, argues that “all things” must include “the hour.”

⁶³ WITKAMP, “Jesus’ Thirst”, 502; SCHNACKENBURG, *St. John* III, 283; BROWN, *John* II, 930; R.A. WHITACRE, *John* (IVPNTCS 4; Downers Grove, IL 1999) 463.

⁶⁴ MOLONEY, *Gospel of John*, 373.

rative is played out against the backdrop of this feast. The Passover is referenced in the time leading up to (12,1; 13,1) and during the passion account (18,28.39; 19,14). The Passover is even mentioned once in the same verse as the "hour" (13,1). Moreover, Passover imagery is specifically applied to Jesus in the passion narrative. The hyssop (John 19,29) recalls the plant used to apply the lamb's blood to the doorposts and lintels during the first Passover (Exod 12,13) and, like the Passover lamb, Jesus' legs were not broken (John 19,36; Exod 12,46; Num 9,2; Ps 34,20). These Passover allusions occur in proximity to Jesus' climactic declaration that "all things" were completed (19,30), thereby suggesting that the offering of Jesus, the lamb that would take away the sins of the world (1,29.36), had been finished ⁶⁵.

The final theme to explore is the "new creation" as it relates to John 19,28.30. Several scholars have suggested that Jesus alluded to Gen 2,2 with his last word τετέλεσται ⁶⁶. In this view, "It is finished" announced Jesus' completion of the work the Father had sent him to do (4,39; 5,36; 17,4.34). To be sure, several creation themes seem to be sounded at the end of John, such as the "Sabbath" (19,31; Gen 2,2), a "garden" (19,41; Gen 2,8), and the breathing of the Spirit upon men (20,22; Gen 2,7).

Long before the "new creation" theology emerged in contemporary scholarship, Asterius the Sophist (d. 341 CE), in a homily on the Psalms, had already explored the typological relationship between the days of creation in Genesis and the days of Christ's final week. In his treatment of the events of the sixth day and the sixth hour, he wrote the following:

Τῇ ἑκτῇ ἐσταυρώθη διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Καὶ οὐ μόνον ἡμέρα ἕκτη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥραν ἕκτην ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον ἐκρέματο, ἐπειδὴ ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας ὥρα ἕκτη ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου γέγονεν, ὅτε Ἀδὰμ τὸν θάνατον ἠρίστησεν, εἴτα ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ ἡμέρᾳ κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν θαυμάτων, ὅτε καὶ τὸ ὄξος ἔπιε καὶ εἶπε· Τετέλεσται ⁶⁷.

⁶⁵ BROWN, *The Death of the Messiah*, II, 1078.

⁶⁶ WRIGHT, *Challenge of Jesus*, 175-177; KÖSTENBERGER, *Theology*, 352-353; BROWN, "Creation's Renewal", 175-290.

⁶⁷ ASTERIUS, *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Homily 21.13.36. For the Greek text see M. RICHARD, *Asterii sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt* (Symbolae Osloenses fasc. suppl. 16; Oslo 1956).

At the very end of this passage, Asterius quotes the words uttered by Christ as they are found in John 19,30 (τετέλεσται). In the passage above, he alludes to and quotes from Gen 2,2, as can be seen by the following textual comparison:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Said of Christ (Asterius) | Said of God (Gen 2,2) |
| “rested” (κατέπαυσεν) | “rested” (κατέπαυσεν) |
| “on the sixth day” | “on the sixth day” |
| (ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ ἡμέρᾳ) | (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ) |
| “from all his works” | “from all his works” |
| (ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν | (ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν |
| ἔργων αὐτοῦ) | ἔργων αὐτοῦ) |
| Christ said “finished” (τετέλεσται) | God “finished” (συνετέλεσεν) |

Just as God finished (συνετέλεσεν) “all of his works” at the creation and rested, so Jesus rested from “all of his marvelous, evangelical works” and announced τετέλεσται. Asterius appears to equate “all his works” with John’s “all things.” If, as we have argued, “all things” encapsulates the passion, the “works” does not refer to the completion of the works done earlier in John (4,39; 5,36; 17,4,34), but rather to the work of the passion that comes to its completion on the cross. When the hour had passed, the cup had been emptied, the Passover lamb had been offered, and the work of the cross had paved the way for the new creation, Jesus announced that moment with the cry, “All things are finished” (19,30).

* *

*

Complex interpretive issues are rarely settled by a single argument alone; it is best when they are based on the convergence of several lines of reasoning. In the first half of this study, syntactical, contextual, and stylistic arguments were combined to show that the phrase “all things” is more likely to be the subject of τετέλεσται in John 19,30 than the traditional translation “it”. The second half of the study proposed that the two occurrences of “all things” (John 18,4; 19,28.30) establish the limits of the entire passion narrative. Therefore, the range of options for the referent of “all things” most likely corresponds to Johannine themes that match the timing and content of the passion narrative (i.e. the “hour”, the “cup”, Passover),

rather than to themes that only refer to one or more aspects of it (e.g., the fulfillment of a particular prophecy).

V. P. Black College of Biblical Studies
Faulkner University
5345 Atlanta Highway
Montgomery, AL 36109
U.S.A.

Floyd O. PARKER JR.

SUMMARY

This article attempts to demonstrate that the unexpressed subject of τετέλεσται in John 19,30 is “all things” (πάντα) rather than “it”, and that this subject should be supplied from the phrase πάντα τετέλεσται found earlier in the passage (John 19,28). The essay also argues that the two occurrences of “all things” (John 18,4 and 19,28.30) encapsulate the passion narrative, and that this phrase is related to other Johannine themes in content and time frame (i.e. the “hour”, the “cup”, and the Passover).

Sankt Paul in Ketten. Zur Paulus-Ikonographie in der Apostelgeschichte und im Corpus Paulinum

In der christlichen Kunst hat es sich seit dem Mittelalter eingebürgert, den Apostel Paulus mit einem Schwert als Attribut zu versehen, um ihn so mit Hinweis auf sein Martyrium zu identifizieren¹. Die Tradition, wonach Paulus enthauptet worden sei, scheint literarisch erstmals gegen Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts² in den Paulusakten (*MartPaul* 3–5) greifbar zu werden und ist seither fester Bestandteil des traditionell gewordenen Paulusbildes. Daneben sind auch ein oder mehrere Bücher fester Bestandteil der Paulus-Ikonographie. Das offizielle Logo des *Anno Paolino* 2008/09 brachte jedoch noch ein weiteres Element zur Geltung: Es zeigt, ganz traditionell, Buch und Schwert, doch den äußeren Rand des Emblems bildet eine Kette. In der Tat wird eine Kette (oder was davon übrig ist), mit welcher der Apostel Paulus gefesselt gewesen sein soll, in der Basilika San Paolo Fuori Le Mura in nächster Nähe des Paulusgrabes ausgestellt und jeweils am 29. Juni in einer Prozession durch das Wohngebiet in der Nähe der Basilika getragen. Die Frage nach der historischen Echtheit dieser Kette wäre prinzipiell gewiss zu stellen, doch damit allein wird man diesem Gegenstand nicht gerecht. Unabhängig von ihrer möglichen Echtheit, hat diese Kette als Symbol und als Erinnerungstück eine Eigendynamik entwickelt. Anders gewendet: In der Kette, ob echt oder nicht, verdichtet sich die Erinnerung an den Apostel Paulus, näherhin an eine bestimmte, maßgebliche Periode in seinem Leben.

Diese Form der Erinnerung an Paulus findet sich literarisch bereits im frühen Christentum. Schon im 1. Clemensbrief (1 Clem 5,6), als man noch mit einer lebendigen Paulus-Erinnerung rechnen konnte (1 Clem 5,1: ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑγγιστα γενομένους ἀθλητάς), wird Paulus ganz selbstverständlich eingeführt als derjenige, der siebenmal

¹ Zur frühen Verehrung der Todes- und Grabstätten in Rom cf. D.L. EASTMAN, *Paul the Martyr. The Cult of the Apostle in the Latin West* (SBLWGRW.S; Atlanta, GA 2011) 15–114.

² Zur Datierung cf. z.B. H.-J. KLAUCK, *Apokryphe Apostelakten. Eine Einführung* (Stuttgart 2005) 64.

Fesseln getragen hat (ἐπτάκις δεσμὰ φορέσας). Dieses Detail hat keine Entsprechung im Selbstzeugnis des Paulus, wenn er in 2 Kor 6,3-10; 11,23-27 seine Leiden und Beschwerne aufzählt³; namentlich die Symbolzahl Sieben macht es unwahrscheinlich, dass hier eine zusätzliche historische Information vorliegt⁴; vermutlich handelt es sich um eine rhetorische Hyperbel, die dieses spezielle Element der Erinnerung an Paulus besonders hervorhebt⁵. Wenn das zutrifft, dann hat hier die Erinnerung an Paulus als mit Ketten gefesselten Häftling schon ein beachtliches Maß an Stilisierung und eine starke Eigendynamik erreicht. Das wirft die Frage auf, wie es zu dieser Stilisierung kam, und dazu ist der Blick ins Neue Testament zu richten. Zunächst ist die Darstellung der Apostelgeschichte zu betrachten (I.), wo die ikonographische Stilisierung des gefesselten Paulus bereits mit der erzählerischen Plausibilität in Konflikt gerät. Nachdem die Fragestellung so verdeutlicht wurde, ist zu erörtern, was Paulus selbst zu seinen Gefängnisaufenthalten und der damit verbundenen Fesselung zu sagen hatte, bzw. wie er sich selbst im Philipper- und Philemonbrief als Gefangenen darstellte (II). Schließlich sind die Paulusdarstellungen der Deuteropaulinen — Kolosserbrief, Epheserbrief, 2 Timotheusbrief — darauf zu befragen, wie sie mit der Erinnerungsfigur eines inhaftierten und gefesselten Paulus umgehen und diese in ihren “Paulinismus” integrieren (III).

³ Die Leidenslisten im 2. Korintherbrief und im 1. Clemensbrief stimmen nur in der Steinigung überein; der Autor des 1. Clemensbriefes dürfte also die Listen aus dem 2. Korintherbrief nicht gekannt haben; cf. A. LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*. Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion (BHT 58; Tübingen 1979) 76; anders H.E. LONA, *Der erste Clemensbrief* (KAV 2; Göttingen 1998) 163: Es handle sich um eine Überbietung des Peristasenkatalogs von 2 Kor 11.

⁴ Nach J.D. QUINN, “Seven Times He Wore Chains (1 Clem 5,6)”, *JBL* 97 (1978) 574-576, v.a. 575 soll sich die Siebenzahl auf die sieben Dokumente beziehen, in denen Paulus als Gefangener auftritt (2 Kor, Apg, Eph, Phil, Kol, Phlm, 2 Tim). Von allen anderen möglichen Einwänden abgesehen, würde das voraussetzen, dass der Autor des 1. Clemensbriefes alle diese sieben Schreiben kannte.

⁵ Cf. LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 76; R.I. PERVO, *The Making of Paul*. Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity (Minneapolis, MN 2010) 132-133; nach LONA, *Der erste Clemensbrief*, 163 stand die Zahlenangabe aber “schon in der vom Vf. übernommenen Tradition”.

I. Die Ketten des Paulus in der Apostelgeschichte

Im letzten Viertel der Apostelgeschichte ist Paulus durchweg Gefangener. Die Gefangenschaft beginnt in Apg 21,33, als römische Truppen Paulus vor der aufgebrachten Menge im Tempel schützen und der Tribun befiehlt, ihn mit zwei Ketten zu fesseln (δεσθῆναι ἀλύσει δυσί). Gleich ob dabei an eine Fesselung an Händen und Füßen (im Anschluss an Apg 21,11) zu denken ist ⁶, oder an Handschellen, mit denen Paulus an zwei Soldaten gefesselt wird ⁷, die Darstellung wird im weiteren Verlauf etwas unplausibel: Paulus bittet in 21,39 darum, zur Menge sprechen zu dürfen, und in 21,40 beginnt er seine Rede mit einer Rednergeste (κατέσεισεν τῇ χειρὶ). Wenn diese Geste für das Publikum wahrnehmbar sein soll, muss der Redner die Hände frei bewegen können; es ist schwer vorstellbar, wie ein — auf welche Weise auch immer — gefesselter Paulus solche Bewegungsfreiheit haben soll. In den Kommentaren wird dies jedoch nur selten als Problem wahrgenommen. Eine gewisse Ausnahme bilden die Ausführungen im Kommentar von Richard Pervo:

“Battered as he is, limited by shackles and in poor repute with the crowd, which has been demanding his obliteration, Paul is able to silence them with a gesture. This is a valuable skill of the most potent and charismatic political leaders, none of whom had had to perform with such physical limitations” ⁸.

Freilich ist Apg 21,33.40 nicht die einzige Stelle in der Apostelgeschichte, an der diese Spannung auftritt; sie begegnet wieder in Kapitel 26, in der letzten großen Rede des Paulus vor König Agrippa II. und dem Statthalter Festus. Die Rede beginnt wiederum

⁶ Cf. W. ECKEY, *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Der Weg des Evangeliums von Jerusalem nach Rom. Teilband 2: Apg 15,36 – 28,31 (Neukirchen-Vluyn 2000) 494.

⁷ Cf. B. RAPSKE, *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody* (The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting 3; Grand Rapids, MI – Carlisle 1994) 140; C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles*. Volume II. Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV–XXVIII (ICC; London – New York 1998) 1022; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles*. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 31; New York et al. 1998) 699.

⁸ R.I. PERVO, *Acts*. A Commentary (ed. H.W. ATTRIDGE) (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN 2009) 557.

in 26,1 mit dem Ausstrecken der Hand als Rednergeste (ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα), aber am Ende der Rede behauptet Paulus offenkundig, er trage Fesseln (26,29: παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων). Hier stellen mehrere Ausleger fest, dass die Rednergeste mit Fesseln schwer vorstellbar ist⁹. Der Versuch, die Szenerie als halbwegs plausibel zu beschreiben, verdeutlicht nur das Problem, so etwa wenn Joseph Fitzmyer schreibt:

“In 26:29 the reader learns that Paul is standing before Agrippa and others in bonds or chains; in spite of them he manages to stretch out his hand in the manner of the classic Greek orator”¹⁰.

Die ganze Rede steht somit in der Spannung zwischen dem Bild von Paulus als Angeklagtem und von Paulus als Redner¹¹; am Ende der Rede in 26,29 erscheinen die Fesseln geradezu als Fremdkörper¹². Damit wirken sie aber besonders auffällig, und so wird deutlich, dass sie — am Ende der letzten öffentlichen Rede des Paulus prominent erwähnt — wesentlich zu dem Bild des Paulus gehören, das Lukas vermitteln will.

Der Eindruck verstärkt sich bei einem Blick auf Apg 28. Im letzten Kapitel der Apostelgeschichte scheint der Umstand, dass Paulus Gefangener ist, zunächst in den Hintergrund zu treten: In Apg 28,1-15 kann er sich mit seinen Begleitern völlig frei bewegen, von militärischer oder anderer Bewachung ist keine Rede. Auch die Haftsituation in Rom wird als privilegiert dargestellt¹³: Es wird Paulus sogar

⁹ Cf. C. BLUMENTHAL, “Paulus vor Gericht — Erwählter Diener und Zeuge. Annäherungen an das lukanische Paulusbild in Apg 21–26”, *Das Paulusbild in der Apostelgeschichte* (eds. R. HOPPE – K. KÖHLER) (Stuttgart 2009) 159-192, 178 n. 31; PERVO, *Acts*, 628, n. 16.

¹⁰ FITZMYER, *Acts*, 755.

¹¹ Cf. E. HEUSLER, *Kapitalprozesse im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Die Verfahren gegen Jesus und Paulus in exegetischer und rechtshistorischer Analyse (NTAbh.NF 38; Münster 2000) 129-130.

¹² Nach ECKEY, *Apostelgeschichte 2*, 551 macht Paulus damit “das Auditorium abschließend auf die Widersinnigkeit seiner Gefangenschaft aufmerksam”. Für PERVO, *Acts*, 637 ist der Hinweis auf die Fesseln ein Element des Pathos zum Abschluss der Rede.

¹³ Cf. BARRETT, *Acts of the Apostles II*, 1232; ECKEY, *Apostelgeschichte 2*, 584; H. OMERZU, “Das Schweigen des Lukas. Überlegungen zum offenen Ende der Apostelgeschichte”, *Das Ende des Paulus*. Historische, theologische

erlaubt (ἐπετράπη), unter Bewachung in der eigenen Wohnung zu leben. Dieser Hausarrest ist der Kontext, in dem die Apostelgeschichte mit der Notiz endet, dass Paulus “mit allem Freimut und ungehindert” (Apg 28,31) die Gottesherrschaft verkünden und über den Herrn Jesus Christus lehren kann — so der Schlussakkord, mit dem Lukas seine Leser aus der Erzählung entlässt¹⁴. Dennoch teilt Paulus seinen Besuchern in Apg 28,20 mit, dass er “wegen der Hoffnung Israels” eine Kette trägt (die einzige Erwähnung von Fesseln in diesem ganzen Kapitel). Dabei mag an Handschellen gedacht sein, mit denen Paulus an den ihn bewachenden Soldaten gefesselt ist¹⁵. In jedem Fall schafft dieser Vers ein spannungsvolles, dialektisches Paulusbild am Ende der Apostelgeschichte. Der Leser wird nicht nur mit der optimistischen Adverbialkonstruktion μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως aus der Handlung entlassen, sondern auch mit dem Bild eines Paulus, der — unbeschadet aller Privilegien und Erleichterungen — nach wie vor Ketten trägt. Er bleibt damit als Ketten tragender Gefangener in Erinnerung, sein persönlicher Weg als ein Leidensweg, der die Vorhersagen von Apg 9,15-16; 20,23; 21,11 einlöst¹⁶.

Wenn man diese Ankündigungen einbezieht, wird das Bild in der Tat noch deutlicher: Sowohl in Apg 20,23 wie in 21,11 wird das Geschick, das Paulus erwartet, vor allem mit Fesseln in Verbindung

und literaturgeschichtliche Aspekte (ed. F.W. HORN) (BZNW 106; Berlin – New York 2001) 127-156, 144-151; J.A. KELHOFFER, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power: Readiness to Withstand Hardship as a Corroboration of Legitimacy in the New Testament* (WUNT 270; Tübingen 2010) 342.

¹⁴ Cf. O. FLICHY, *La figure de Paul dans les Actes des Apôtres*. Un phénomène de réception de la tradition paulinienne à la fin du I^{er} siècle (LD 214; Paris 2008) 317; J. SCHRÖTER, “Paulus als Modell christlicher Zeugenschaft. Apg 9,15f. und 28,30f. als Rahmen der lukanischen Paulusdarstellung und Rezeption des ‘historischen’ Paulus”, *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*. Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des Apôtres (ed. D. MARGUERAT) (BETL 229; Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2009) 53-80, 78; ähnlich auch C.S. WANSINK, *Chained in Christ. The Experience and Rhetoric of Paul’s Imprisonments* (JSNT.S 130; Sheffield 1996) 206.

¹⁵ Cf. FITZMYER, *Acts*, 788; PERVO, *Acts*, 683 n. 27. Nach RAPSKE, *Paul in Roman Custody*, 181 soll es sich dabei um eine relativ leichte Kette handeln.

¹⁶ Cf. D. MARGUERAT, “L’image de Paul dans les Actes des Apôtres”, *Les Actes des Apôtres*. Histoire, récit, théologie. XXe congrès de l’Association catholique française pour l’étude de la Bible. Angers 2003 (ed. M. BERDER) (LD 199; Paris 2008) 121-154, 152; BLUMENTHAL, “Paulus vor Gericht”, 182; KELHOFFER, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power*, 328.

gebracht; vom Tod ist hingegen nicht ausdrücklich die Rede. Besonders auffällig ist die Prophezeiung des Agabos in Apg 21,11: Sie entspricht nicht genau dem, was ab 21,27 passiert (Paulus wird ja von den Römern verhaftet und niemandem übergeben); wahrscheinlich soll sie eine Parallele zu den Leidensankündigungen Jesu herstellen (v.a. Lk 18,32)¹⁷. Das Motiv der Fesselung geht aber über die Jesus-Paulus-Parallele hinaus und erweist sich somit als ein *Proprium* der lukanischen Paulus-Darstellung.

Diese Ausführungen haben nur einen kleinen Aspekt der Paulusdarstellung in der Apostelgeschichte in den Blick genommen, und doch fügen sie sich — unwillkürlich, möchte man sagen — in eine Interpretationsrichtung der Apostelgeschichte ein, die seit einigen Jahren vor allem im französischen¹⁸ und deutschen Sprachraum¹⁹ als wegweisend etabliert hat: Es geht um die historische Referenzialität der Apostelgeschichte: Jenseits der polarisierenden Alternative „historisch zuverlässig“ versus „romanhaft fiktional“, wird die Apostelgeschichte als eine Form der Erinnerung an die früheste Periode des Christentums betrachtet. Lukas wird als gestaltender Autor gewürdigt, der das Wissen über die Vergangenheit in sinnvoller Weise ordnet, organisiert, und präsentiert — um der Christen in seiner Zeit willen: Durch erinnernde Rückbindung an die Ursprünge will er sie in ihrer Identität bestärken — das dürfte in Lk 1,4 mit ἀσφάλεια gemeint sein²⁰. Dabei teilt Lukas nach Lk 1,1-4 dem Leser nichts sachlich Neues mit; er bringt vielmehr die kollektive Erinnerung christlicher Gemeinden in einer sinnvollen Anordnung

¹⁷ Cf. BARRETT, *Acts of the Apostles II*, 995-998; ECKEY, *Apostelgeschichte* 2, 483; PERVO, *Acts*, 538.

¹⁸ Cf. z.B. MARGUERAT, „L’image de Paul“; ID., „Paul après Paul: une histoire de réception“, *NTS* 54 (2008) 317-337; FLICHY, *La figure de Paul*, 35-49.

¹⁹ Cf. z.B. J. SCHRÖTER, „Kirche im Anschluss an Paulus. Aspekte der Paulusrezeption in der Apostelgeschichte und in den Pastoralbriefen“, *ZNW* 98 (2007) 77-104; ID., „Paulus als Modell“, v.a. aber K. BACKHAUS, „Lukas der Maler. Die Apostelgeschichte als intentionale Geschichte der christlichen Erstepoche“, ID. – G. HÄFNER, *Historiographie und fiktionales Erzählen. Zur Konstruktivität in Geschichtstheorie und Exegese* (BTS 86; Neukirchen-Vluyn 2007) 30-66.

²⁰ Cf. auch BACKHAUS, „Lukas der Maler“, 31, 43-59; ID., „ΣΚΕΥΟΣ ΕΚΛΟΓΗΣ. Paulus als theologischer Topos in der Apostelgeschichte“, *Paulus — Werk und Wirkung*. FS A. Lindemann (eds. P.-G. KLUMBIES – D.S. DU TOIT) (Tübingen 2013) 413-434, 415-417.

zur Artikulation. Insofern er sich dabei gestaltend betätigt und dem Ideal der Anschaulichkeit (ἐνάργεια) folgt, erscheint es aber durchaus angemessen, von Bildern (nicht nur Abbildern) zu sprechen, die dieser Autor komponiert ²¹. Im Bereich der kaiserzeitlichen Rhetorik präsentiert auch etwa Quintilian (Inst. Or. 8,3,61-71) die veranschaulichende Redeweise als ein Mittel, um beim Hörer geradezu visuelle Eindrücke hervorzurufen — und er bedient sich dazu seinerseits mehrerer Metaphern aus dem Bereich des Visuellen:

Quintilian, Inst. Or. 8,3,62: “Eine große Leistung ist es, die Dinge, von denen wir sprechen, klar darzustellen und so, dass man sie zu sehen scheint (*ut cerni videantur*). Die Rede bewirkt nämlich noch nicht genug und herrscht noch nicht so vollständig, wie sie soll, wenn sie nur bis zu den Ohren wirkt und der Richter glaubt, dass ihm das, worüber er entscheidet, (nur) erzählt, nicht aber herausgehoben und dem geistigen Auge gezeigt werde (*oculis mentis ostendi*)”.

Wenn man aber die Metapher des Bildes in diesen literarischen Zusammenhängen für hilfreich hält, ist es eigentlich nur folgerichtig, die vom Autor gebotenen Bilder und ihre einzelnen Elemente auch mit den Mitteln der Ikonographie zu betrachten. Im Folgenden werden daher Überlegungen, die eigentlich im Hinblick auf die Interpretation von Werken der bildenden Kunst angestellt wurden, auf die Interpretation von Texten angewandt, um sozusagen die literarische Ikonographie in der Paulusdarstellung der Apostelgeschichte zu erschließen.

Die Ikonographie/Ikonologie als systematische Form der Bildbetrachtung verbindet sich vor allem mit dem Namen des Kunsthistorikers Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968). Panofsky entwickelte ein dreistufiges Interpretationsschema, das drei Bedeutungsschichten eines Kunstwerkes erfassen soll ²²: Am Anfang steht die prä-ikonographische Betrachtung, die sich auf die Benennung und Aufzählung der einzelnen Bildmotive beschränkt. Als zweite Stufe folgt die ikonographische Analyse im engeren Sinne, bei der es um das Thema

²¹ Cf. etwa BACKHAUS, “Lukas der Maler”, 30-31; ID., “ΣΚΕΥΟΣ ΕΚΛΟΓΗΣ”, 416-417.

²² Cf. insgesamt E. PANOFSKY, *Studies in Iconology*. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance (New York 1939) 3-31, 5-8 (ID., *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Papers in and on Art History [New York 1955] 26-54, 28-31); auch R. VAN STRATEN, *Einführung in die Ikonographie* (übers. von R.E. FEILCHENFELDT) (Berlin ³2004) 16.

des Kunstwerkes, um die Komposition und Kombination der einzelnen Motive geht. Darauf baut schließlich die dritte Stufe auf, die Ikonographie im tieferen Sinne bzw. die Ikonologie, die nach den dem Bild zugrunde liegenden Grundhaltungen oder Prinzipien fragt. Diese eigentlich nicht mehr analytische, sondern synthetische Leistung bezeichnete Panofsky zunächst als Ikonographie im tieferen Sinne²³, doch im Neuabdruck von 1955 führte er dafür den Begriff "iconology" ein²⁴. Im Anschluss daran zerlegt etwa Roelof van Straten diesen dritten Interpretationsschritt in zwei eigenständige Vorgänge: die ikonographische Interpretation, die (kunsthistorisch) nach der tieferen Bedeutung des Kunstwerkes fragt, wie sie vom Künstler beabsichtigt wurde, und die ikonologische Interpretation, die (kulturhistorisch) fragt, warum das Kunstwerk geschaffen wurde und warum es gerade so geschaffen wurde²⁵. Bei letzterem geht es also dezidiert um die geistesgeschichtlichen Bedingungen und Kontexte des Kunstwerkes.

Im vorliegenden Beitrag wird jedoch nur ein Einzelmotiv des Paulusbildes in der Apostelgeschichte betrachtet, die Fesseln bzw. Ketten des Paulus. Insofern haben sich die oben angestellten Überlegungen zunächst auf eine prä-ikonographische Sichtung des Bildmaterials beschränkt. Doch auch die ikonographische Analyse im engeren Sinne wurde oben bereits angerissen, insofern die Bedeutung dieses Motivs für das Paulusbild der Apostelgeschichte zur Sprache kam. Eine im tieferen Sinne ikonographische bzw. ikonologische Betrachtung ist jedoch im Rahmen dieses Beitrages nicht umfassend zu leisten. Sie wäre gegeben, wenn man sich in einer umfassenden Studie dem Paulusbild der Apostelgeschichte nebst seinen Hintergründen widmete. Der vorliegende Beitrag beschränkt sich indes darauf, dieser Paulus-Ikonographie zuzuarbeiten.

Auf der Ebene dieser Vor- und Zuarbeit ist vor allem zu fragen, ob und, wenn ja, warum es überhaupt zulässig sei, die Fesseln des Paulus, die in der Apostelgeschichte verschiedentlich erwähnt werden, als Sinn tragendes Element in eine ikonographisch-ikonologische Betrachtung einzubeziehen. Anders gewendet: Was berechtigt zu der Annahme, dass die Fesseln bzw. Ketten in der Apostelgeschichte

²³ Cf. PANOFSKY, *Studies in Iconology*, 8.

²⁴ Cf. PANOFSKY, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 30-31

²⁵ Cf. VAN STRATEN, *Einführung in die Ikonographie*, 16.30-31.

als (identifizierendes) Attribut²⁶ bzw. als ikonographisches Symbol der Paulusdarstellung intendiert sind? Warum sollten sie, mehr als andere Bildelemente, eine besondere erzählerisch-ikonographische, wenn nicht gar ikonologische, Funktion haben? Die hervorgehobene Stellung der Fesseln in Apg 26,29; 28,20 lässt schon vermuten, dass die Fesseln nicht einfach nur ein notwendiges Requisit der Handlung sind, sondern über sich hinaus verweisen und als Symbol eine Aussage über Paulus machen²⁷ — Paulus soll als Gefangener in Erinnerung bleiben. Die oben beobachtete Spannung zwischen Fesseln und Rednergeste bietet ein deutliches Indiz: Das Motiv der Fesseln steht sperrig bzw. unplausibel im Bild; die Fesseln sind erzählerisch alles andere als notwendig, sondern eher störend. Gerade dadurch werden sie aber hervorgehoben: Der Leser/Betrachter soll gezielt auf dieses Element gestoßen werden. Diese Beobachtung konvergiert mit den inneren Gründen, die Göran Hermerén dafür anführt, dass ein Bildelement ein ikonographisches Symbol sein soll²⁸: Neben der besonders sorgfältigen Ausführung und der zentralen Stellung in der Bildkomposition zählt dazu auch, dass es als “strange” auffällt, sich jedenfalls nicht selbstverständlich in die Szenerie einfügt. In der christlichen Kunst ist dies ja bei den meisten Heiligenattributen zu beobachten. Das Beispiel der Heiligenattribute in der christlichen Kunst weist zugleich auf eine weitere Bedingung hin: Damit ein Symbol als solches “funktionieren” kann, ist ein Deutungskontext, eine kulturelle Enzyklopädie, vonnöten, wodurch dem Symbol seine konventionelle Bedeutung zugewiesen wird; anders gewendet: um “funktionieren” zu können, ist das Symbol auf eine Deutungstradition angewiesen²⁹. In der Semiotik würde man diese als Interpretant bezeichnen³⁰. Panofsky, der sich *materialiter* für Renaissancekunst interessierte,

²⁶ Cf. dazu etwa G. HERMERÉN, *Representation and Meaning in the Visual Arts. A Study in the Methodology of Iconography and Iconology* (Lund Studies in Philosophy I; Stockholm – Göteborg – Lund 1969) 100; VAN STRATEN, *Einführung in die Ikonographie*, 60.

²⁷ Cf. dazu HERMERÉN, *Representation and Meaning*, 78; VAN STRATEN, *Einführung in die Ikonographie*, 57.

²⁸ Cf. HERMERÉN, *Representation and Meaning*, 83-85.

²⁹ Cf. HERMERÉN, *Representation and Meaning*, 79.

³⁰ Cf. dazu im Überblick A. WEISSENRIEDER – F. WENDT, “Images as Communication. The Methods of Iconography”, *Picturing the New Testament. Studies in Ancient Visual Images* (ed. A. WEISSENRIEDER – F. WENDT – P. VON GEMÜNDEN) (WUNT II 193; Tübingen 2005) 3-49, 28-37.

fand diese Deutungstradition vor allem in literarischen Texten der Zeit ³¹. Diese Vorgehensweise mag im Blick auf antike Kunstwerke nicht ganz unproblematisch sein ³², doch wenn es um bildliche Ausdrucksweise in Texten des Neuen Testaments geht, steht mit den frühchristlichen Traditionen, die in den erhaltenen Texten eine literarische Verfestigung und Verdichtung gefunden haben, eine "Enzyklopädie" zur Verfügung, die das Unterfangen nicht aussichtslos erscheinen lässt, den traditionsgegeschichtlichen Verständnishintergrund der fraglichen Texte aus der Apostelgeschichte zu umreißen. Der Rest dieses Beitrages ist daher der Frage nach dieser Deutungstradition im Blick auf die Fesseln des Paulus gewidmet. Zunächst wird nach den Grundlagen bei Paulus selbst gefragt, der sich ja im Philipper- und Philemonbrief zu seiner Haftsituation geäußert hat (II). Sodann richtet sich der Blick auf die Rezeption dieses Bildes, das Paulus von sich selbst gezeichnet hat, in den deuteropaulinischen Schriften des Neuen Testaments (III). Ohne irgendwelche literarischen Abhängigkeiten behaupten zu wollen, wird damit ein traditioneller Deutungskontext umrissen, vor dessen Hintergrund es für Lukas sinnvoll war, Fesseln bzw. Ketten als ikonographisches Symbol in seine Paulusdarstellung einzubinden.

II. Ketten und Fesseln in den authentischen Paulusbriefen ³³

Unter den unstrittig echten Paulusbriefen dürfen der Philipperbrief und der Philemonbrief als "Gefangenschaftsbriefe" gelten, da sie auf eine Abfassungssituation hinweisen, in der Paulus sich in Haft befand. Meistens wird angenommen, dass beide Briefe während derselben Haft entstanden sind; jedenfalls fehlt ein klares Indiz für die gegenteilige Annahme. Als Ort dieser Haft — und damit auch als Abfassungsort des Philipper- und Philemonbriefes — wird meistens Rom ³⁴

³¹ Cf. PANOFSKY, *Studies in Iconology*, 11-13 (Id., *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 35-37).

³² Cf. WEISSENRIEDER – WENDT, "Images as Communication", 10-12.

³³ Für ausführliche Erörterungen zu diesem Punkt cf. S. WITETSCHEK, "Der Gefangene Christi Jesu und seine Fesseln. Hintergründe und Deutung", *Paul's Greco-Roman Context. Crossing Points* (ed. C. BREYTENBACH) (BETL 277; Leuven 2015) 579-593.

³⁴ Cf. z.B. J.D.G. DUNN, *Christianity in the Making*. Volume 2: Beginning from Jerusalem (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge 2009) 1009-1011; U. SCHNELLE,

oder Ephesos ³⁵ vorgeschlagen. Für letztere Option spricht vor allem, dass Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter (noch) ganz mit der Mission im ägäischen Raum befasst sind und etwa mit Philippi in regem Austausch stehen. Wenn die Ephesos-Hypothese zutrifft, dann ist die Haft, aus der Paulus den Philipper- und Philemonbrief schrieb, in den Peristasenkatalogen 2 Kor 6,4-10; 11,23-29 in dem summarischen ἐν φυλακῇ (6,5; 11,23) inbegriffen.

In beiden Briefen bezeichnet Paulus seine Haftsituation jedoch metonymisch mit dem Haftmittel δεσμός/-ά. Die Fesselung wird in den Peristasenkatalogen des 2. Korintherbriefes nicht eigens erwähnt, obwohl sie zu den mehrfachen Auspeitschungen (11,24-25) gut passen würde. Dennoch ist davon auszugehen, dass Paulus in der Haft, in der er den Philipper- und Philemonbrief schrieb, tatsächlich gefesselt war; auch ein mögliches römisches Bürgerrecht steht dem nicht prinzipiell entgegen: Angesichts der üblichen Massenunterbringung der Gefangenen war die Fesselung aus Sicherheitsgründen schlichtweg notwendig und darf als Regelfall gelten ³⁶. Im Neuen Testament wird in Apg 16,26 selbstverständlich vorausgesetzt, dass Gefangene gefesselt waren; dies wird, anders als die Auspeitschung, auch nicht als besonderer Übergriff gesehen (Apg 16,37).

1. Der Philipperbrief

Im Philipperbrief kann Paulus anscheinend voraussetzen, dass die Adressaten schon länger über seine Haft informiert sind (Phil

Einleitung in das Neue Testament (UTB 1830; Göttingen 82013) 159-163.174; *ex negativo* M. GIELEN, "Paulus — Gefangener in Ephesus?", *BN* 131 (2006) 79-103; *BN* 133 (2007) 63-77.

³⁵ Cf. z.B. H. CONZELMANN – A. LINDEMANN, *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament* (UTB 52; Tübingen 142004) 250-251; S. WITETSCHKE, *Ephesische Enthüllungen 1. Frühe Christen in einer antiken Großstadt*. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Frage nach den Kontexten der Johannesapokalypse (*Biblical Tools and Studies* 6; Leuven 2008) 198-206; H. OMERZU, "Spurensuche: Apostelgeschichte und Paulusbriefe als Zeugnisse einer ephesischen Gefangenschaft des Paulus", *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie* (eds. J. FREY – C.K. ROTHSCHILD – J. SCHRÖTER) (BZNW 162; Berlin – New York 2009) 295-326; D.A. KOCH, *Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Ein Lehrbuch (Göttingen 2013) 570-572.

³⁶ Cf. dazu T. MOMMSEN, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft I/4; Leipzig 1899; Reprint Darmstadt 1955) 300-301; RAPSKE, *Paul in Roman Custody*, 25-26; J.-U. KRAUSE, *Ge-*

4,14; auch über die Erkrankung des Epaphroditos wissen sie nach Phil 2,26 schon Bescheid). Entsprechend kann er in Phil 1,7.13 seine Fesseln ganz beiläufig einführen. Dennoch muss er sie in Phil 1,12-18 thematisieren, denn die Fesselung bedeutet nicht zuletzt eine Beeinträchtigung des persönlichen Prestiges, und am Haftort scheint sich Paulus der Unterstützung durch Mitchristen nicht mehr ganz sicher zu sein: Nach Phil 1,17 meinen zumindest einige $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\epsilon\iota\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon$. Die Formulierung ist nicht ganz eindeutig, vermutlich ist aber der Dativ als *dativus instrumentalis* zu verstehen: Die Haftsituation des Paulus droht auch andere Christen in Schwierigkeiten zu bringen; vielleicht ist an Christen gedacht, die sich durch häufige Besuche bei Paulus ihrerseits verdächtig machten. Möglicherweise gewähren dunkle Formulierungen wie diese auch einen Einblick in die Haftsituation, in der Wachpersonal und Mitgefangene unwillkürlich mithören mussten, was Paulus diktierte; dies mag für ihn ein Grund gewesen sein, seine Zunge zu hüten³⁷.

Ähnliche Vorbehalte, wie sie in Phil 1,17 artikuliert werden, mögen auch in Philippi im Raum gestanden sein, jedenfalls bietet Paulus seinen Philippern eine positive Deutung der Haft: Er trägt seine Fesseln "in Christus" (Phil 1,13), nicht als Verbrecher. Das wurde im ganzen Prätorium offenbar, und auch die Christen in Philippi sollen sich diese positive Sicht auf die Fesseln des Paulus zu eigen machen³⁸. Wir beobachten in diesem kleinen Abschnitt eine Umwertung der Werte: Die Haft ist nun kein Anlass zu Scham und Peinlichkeit, sondern sie bietet eine missionarische Chance (Phil 1,12-14), und die Fesseln werden "in Christus" geradezu zu einer Auszeichnung. Damit begründet Paulus in Phil 1 den literarischen Topos "Paulus

fängnisse im Römischen Reich (HABES 23; Stuttgart 1996) 273-276, 283-386. Für die Bandbreite von Haftformen cf. Y. RIVIÈRE, *Le cachot et les fers. Détention et coercition à Rome (L'antiquité au présent)* (Paris 2004) 118-131.

³⁷ Cf. in diesem Sinne, wenngleich mit Differenzen im Detail, A. STANDHARTINGER, "Aus der Welt eines Gefangenen. Die Kommunikationsstruktur des Philipperbriefs im Spiegel seiner Abfassungssituation", *NT* 55 (2013) 140-167, 145-146, 155-161.

³⁸ Cf. C. CLIVAZ, "La rumeur, une catégorie pour articuler autoportraits et réceptions de Paul. 'Car ses lettres, dit-on, ont du poids ... et sa parole est nulle' (2 Co 10,10)", *Reception of Paulinism in Acts. Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des Apôtres* (ed. D. MARGUERAT) (BETL 229; Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2009) 239-259, 250.

der Gefangene”³⁹, der in der späteren Paulusrezeption eine maßgebliche Rolle spielt.

2. Der Philemonbrief

Im Philemonbrief ist dieser Topos schon weiter entwickelt. Wenn Paulus sich in Phlm 1 nicht als Apostel (1 Kor 1,1; 2 Kor 1,1; Gal 1,1) oder Diener (Röm 1,1; Phil 1,1), sondern als “der Gefangene Christi Jesu” einführt und diese Selbstbezeichnung in Phlm 9 an strategisch entscheidender Stelle wiederholt, hat sich die positive Deutung von Haft und Fesseln schon deutlich verfestigt und kann schon als traditionell gelten: Paulus muss seine Situation nicht mehr so ausführlich problematisieren wie in Phil 1,12-18, er kann schon voraussetzen, dass sie bekannt und akzeptiert ist. Er kann sie in Phlm 8-10 sogar benutzen, um Autorität aufzubauen: Dass er dem Philemon Anweisungen geben (ἐπιτάσσειν) könnte, scheint außer Frage zu stehen, doch der Status als Gefangener gibt auch seiner Bitte (παρακαλῶ) hinreichendes Gewicht. Wir beobachten hier eine Konstruktion von Autorität, die im Verzicht auf (formale) Autorität gründet. Soweit Paulus hier argumentiert, tut er es ähnlich wie im Philipperbrief (cf. Phil 1,13): Was ihn in seiner Bewegungsfreiheit behindert, sind die “Fesseln des Evangeliums” (Phlm 13), die Fesseln, die er – seiner Deutung nach – um des Evangeliums willen trägt⁴⁰. Deswegen benötigt er Unterstützung, und deswegen kann ihm Philemon die Unterstützung nicht verweigern. Im Prinzip liegt im Philemonbrief also das gleiche Problem vor wie im Philipperbrief, doch Paulus hat nun schon ein bewährtes Deutungsmuster für seine Situation als Gefangener. Anscheinend hat er die grundlegende Reflexion aus dem Philipperbrief weiter entwickelt und verfestigt: Nun versteht er sich selbst als “der Gefangene Christi Jesu”. Als solcher besitzt er, trotz der eigentlich belastenden und ehrenrührigen Haftsituation, Prestige und Autorität, und als solcher bleibt er dem Philemon und

³⁹ Cf. E.-M. BECKER, “Polemik und Autobiographie. Ein Vorschlag zur Deutung von Phil 3,2-4a”, *Polemik in der frühchristlichen Literatur. Texte und Kontexte* (eds. O. WISCHMEYER – L. SCORNAIENCHI) (BZNW 170; Berlin – New York 2010) 233-254, 248-249.

⁴⁰ Cf. dazu WANSINK, *Chained in Christ*, 147-174; J.A. FITZMYER, *The Letter to Philemon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 34C; New York 2000) 106.

anderen Lesern und Hörern in Erinnerung. Der Weg zur Stilisierung des Paulus als des habituellen Gefangenen ist frei und wird in den deuteropaulinischen Schriften in unterschiedlicher Weise beschritten.

III. Ketten und Fesseln in den deuteropaulinischen Briefen

Anders als im Philipper- und Philemonbrief, schreibt in den deuteropaulinischen Briefen nicht ein Häftling aus einer realen Haftsituation, sondern nachpaulinische Autoren nutzen den schon verfestigten Topos von Paulus als Gefangenen, um in der *persona* des (literarisch durch die Haft, historisch durch seinen Tod) abwesenden Apostels ihren "Paulusbriefen" einen Sitz in der Lebensgeschichte des Paulus zu geben. Im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief einerseits und im 2. Timotheusbrief andererseits wird dieser Topos in unterschiedlicher Weise ausgewertet. Diese Beobachtung, die unten noch weiter entfaltet wird, verstärkt den Eindruck, dass sich die Paulusrezeption im späten 1. bzw. frühen 2. Jahrhundert in mehreren verschiedenen Strömungen entwickelte. Umso bemerkenswerter ist, dass in mindestens drei dieser Strömungen (Kol – Eph, 2 Tim, Apg) der Topos von Paulus als Gefangenen grundlegende Bedeutung besitzt. Wesentlich deutlicher als bei Paulus selbst, wird nun das Haftmittel, die Fesseln (δεσμοί/-ά) bzw. Kette (ἄλυσις), thematisiert und geradezu ikonographisch hervorgehoben.

1. Der Kolosserbrief

Der Kolosserbrief ist, wie Andreas Lindemann ausführte, "sehr bewußt als Gefangenschaftsbrief konzipiert worden"⁴¹. In der Tat schließen sich schon an den eröffnenden Christus-Hymnus (Kol 1,15-20) Erörterungen über die Leiden (παθήματα, 1,24) und Mühen (κοπιᾶω, 1,29) des Apostels an⁴². Diese bleiben jedoch unspezifisch. Wenn man die konkreteren Hinweise in Kol 4 als Schlüssel für diesen Abschnitt auffasst, kann man unter den Leiden die in Kol 4 evozierte Haftsituation verstehen⁴³. Wahrscheinlicher

⁴¹ LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 39.

⁴² Nach PERVO, *Making of Paul*, 69-70 soll dieses Pathos die Autorität des (definitiv abwesenden) Apostels stärken.

⁴³ Cf. R.J. CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*. Roman Imprisonment and the Letters of St Paul (New York 2001) 89.

ist aber, dass umgekehrt die grundsätzlichen Ausführungen in Kol 1 einen umfassenden Verständnishorizont bieten, in den die Haftsituation, die in Kol 4 zur Sprache kommt, sich exemplarisch eintragen lässt⁴⁴. Damit entsteht in Kol 1 gewissermaßen ein abstraktes Bild des Paulus, das die Gestalt des Apostels aus ihrer historischen Kontingenz löst, um das Augenmerk deutlicher auf seine Rolle im Heilsgeschehen⁴⁵ zu richten (cf. Kol 1,23.24-29)⁴⁶; zutreffend spricht Andreas Dettwiler hier von einer “icônisation” der Paulus-Gestalt⁴⁷. Im letzten Kapitel bekommt die vom Autor des Kolosserbriefes gemalte Paulus-Ikone jedoch auch konkrete Züge, jetzt wird auch die Gefangenschaft explizit Teil des Bildes⁴⁸. In Kol 4,3, im Zusammenhang der Bitte um das Gebetsgedenken, kommt sie als Nachsatz in Spiel: “Paulus” bittet die Leser um ihr Gebet, damit er das Mysterium Christi aussprechen kann⁴⁹ — und fügt dann, etwas überraschend, als Nachsatz an: ... δι’ ὃ καὶ δέδεμαι. Der Autor muss diesen Nachsatz nicht weiter erklären, und so liegt es nahe, dass die Haft bzw. Fesselung zur Abfassungszeit des Kolosserbriefes schon ein fester Bestandteil des überlieferten Paulusbildes — man könnte auch sagen: der Paulus-Ikonographie — war⁵⁰. Dieser Eindruck

⁴⁴ Cf. LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 39.

⁴⁵ Cf. H.O. MAIER, *Picturing Paul in Empire*. Imperial Image, Text and Persuasion in Colossians, Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles (London – New York 2013) 65-66. Zurückhaltender A. STANDHARTINGER, *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte und Intention des Kolosserbriefes* (NT.S 94; Leiden – Boston – Köln 1999) 164-168, 175: Mit Kol 1,24 soll dem Leiden und Tod des Paulus Sinn verliehen werden.

⁴⁶ Cf. S. HÜBENTHAL, “Pseudepigraphie als Strategie in frühchristlichen Identitätsdiskursen? Überlegungen am Beispiel des Kolosserbriefes”, *SNTUA* 36 (2011) 61-92, 83-85; auch N. FRANK, *Der Kolosserbrief im Kontext des paulinischen Erbes* (WUNT II 271; Tübingen 2009) 90-92; L. BORMANN, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser* (THKNT 10/1; Leipzig 2012) 111-114.

⁴⁷ Cf. A. DETTWILER, “Auctoritas Pauli selon la littérature deutéro-paulinienne et l’œuvre lucanienne”, *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*. Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des Apôtres (ed. D. MARGUERAT) (BETL 229; Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA 2009) 305-323, 307; im Hinblick auf die Autoritätskonstruktion cf. auch WANSINK, *Chained in Christ*, 205.

⁴⁸ Für intratextuelle Beziehungen zwischen Kol 1,23-38 und 4,2-6 cf. FRANK, *Kolosserbrief*, 62-63.

⁴⁹ Nach STANDHARTINGER, *Studien*, 160-162 soll damit die Verteidigung vor Gericht gemeint sein.

⁵⁰ Cf. auch STANDHARTINGER, *Studien*, 162.

verstärkt sich, wenn man Kol 4,18, den letzten Vers des Briefes, mit in den Blick nimmt. Im Schlussgruß, zwischen Eigenhändigkeitsvermerk und abschließendem Gnadenwunsch, fügt der Autor den Appell ein: *μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν*. Wenn man diese Passage mit dem sehr ähnlich formulierten Briefschluss des 1. Korintherbriefes (1 Kor 16,21-24) vergleicht, nimmt der Verweis auf die Fesseln den Platz der Anathema-Formel und des “Marana tha” ein:

| 1 Kor 16,21-24 | Kol 4,18 |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 21 Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. | Ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου. |
| 22 εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα. μαράνα θά. | μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν. |
| 23 ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ μεθ’ ὑμῶν. 24 ἡ ἀγάπη μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. | ἡ χάρις μεθ’ ὑμῶν. |

So klingt der Kolosserbrief betont mit dem Bild des gefesselten Apostels aus, ohne dass dies im Brief “erarbeitet” worden wäre. Umso deutlicher zeigt sich hier aber, dass es eben die Fesseln des Paulus sind, die in Erinnerung bleiben sollen ⁵¹. Möglicherweise gehören die Fesseln auch zu dem Identitätsangebot, das der pseud-epigraphe Autor seinen Lesern unterbreitet ⁵². Ob und inwiefern dahinter reale Spannungen mit staatlichen oder lokalen Behörden stehen, oder auch eine anderweitige Situation der Unterdrückung, wie etwa Philip F. Esler für den Kolosser- und Epheserbrief wie auch für den 2. Timotheusbrief (v.a. 2 Tim 3,1-9.12) annimmt ⁵³, muss freilich dahingestellt bleiben. In der ikonologischen Frage kommen wir also, mangels äußerer Indizien, nicht wesentlich weiter.

⁵¹ Zur Erinnerung als argumentativer Strategie im Kolosserbrief cf. jetzt auch A. DETTWILER, “La lettre aux Colossiens: une théologie de la mémoire”, *NTS* 59 (2013) 109-128. Kol 4,18 wird dort allerdings nicht besprochen.

⁵² Cf. dazu HÜBENTHAL, “Pseudepigraphie”, 85-92.

⁵³ Cf. P.F. ESLER, “Remember My Fetters: Memorialisation of Paul’s Imprisonment”, *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism*. Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science (eds. P. LUOMANEN – I. PYYSÄINEN – R. URO) (Biblical Interpretation Series 89; Leiden – Boston 2007) 231-258, 236-237, 241.248; ähnlich auch STANDHARTINGER, *Studien*, 190-194.

Der Kolosserbrief selbst gibt jedenfalls keine klaren Hinweise darauf, dass der Autor annimmt, seine Adressaten stünden unter Druck von außen ⁵⁴. Auffällig ist jedoch die Verbindung des Fessel-Motivs mit dem Eigenhändigkeitsvermerk: Das Paulusbild, das als "authentisch" in Erinnerung bleiben soll, ist das des Apostels, der in Fesseln an seine Gemeinden schreibt ⁵⁵. So gehören die Fesseln schon fest zur ikonographisch gefassten Persönlichkeit des Paulus: Paulus ist in jedem Fall der Apostel in Fesseln ⁵⁶. Ein literarischer Grund dafür, dass die Gefangenschaft des Paulus im Briefschluss so stark hervorgehoben wird, mag in der Pseudepigraphie des Kolosserbriefes liegen. Der Brief soll die Distanz zwischen Paulus und den Lesern überbrücken: Paulus ist ja physisch abwesend und so daran gehindert, seine Botschaft persönlich weiterzugeben. Historisch war er zur Abfassungszeit des Kolosserbriefes vermutlich daran gehindert, weil er schon tot war. Der pseudepigraphische Verfasser kann zwar nicht den toten Paulus einen Brief schreiben lassen, aber innerhalb seiner Fiktion bringt er die Entzogenheit des Apostels mit dem Motiv der Fesseln literarisch ins Bild ⁵⁷.

2. Der Epheserbrief

Im Epheserbrief ist eine noch stärkere Stilisierung und "Ikonisierung" des Paulus festzustellen ⁵⁸. Das mag auch dadurch bedingt sein, dass der in diesem Schreiben gezeichnete Paulus sich nicht an konkreten Konflikten beteiligt ⁵⁹.

⁵⁴ Cf. dazu auch MAIER, *Picturing Paul*, 65.

⁵⁵ Cf. CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 92-93.

⁵⁶ Cf. J. GNILKA, *Der Kolosserbrief* (HTKNT 10/1; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1980) 247; CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 87-88.92-93; CLIVAZ, "La rumeur", 241-242. Anders E. SCHWEIZER, *Der Brief an die Kolosser* (EKK 12; Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1976) 179; LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 40: Die Persönlichkeit des Apostels trete hinter der von ihm vertretenen Sache zurück.

⁵⁷ Cf. dazu I. MAISCH, *Der Brief an die Gemeinde in Kolossä* (TKNT 12; Stuttgart 2003) 261-263, 274; ähnlich STANDHARTINGER, *Studien*, 175; aufschlussreich auch PERVO, *Making of Paul*, 12, 70, 118.

⁵⁸ Cf. DETTWILER, "Auctoritas Pauli", 307.

⁵⁹ Cf. LINDEMANN, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 41. Entsprechend ist für DETTWILER, "Auctoritas Pauli", 307 die Darstellung der Leiden des Paulus "étrangement pâle et discrète".

In Eph 3,1 führt sich "Paulus", in Weiterführung und Ergänzung des Präskripts (Eph 1,1: "Apostel Christi Jesu")⁶⁰, als "der Gefangene Christi [Jesu]" ein, ohne dass im unmittelbaren Kontext die Haft-situation weiter thematisiert würde⁶¹. Erst in 3,13 findet sich wieder ein knapper, blasser Hinweis auf die Bedrängnisse, die "Paulus" für seine Leser erleidet. In Eph 3,1 ist nun das Entscheidende, dass Paulus "für" die Heiden Gefangener ist, um ihnen das Mysterium Christi zu vermitteln⁶². Der Gedanke von Phil 1,13 (weitergeführt in Phil 1,9), wo Paulus aus der Not seiner Haft eine Tugend gemacht hat, ist hier aufgegriffen und zum Prinzip erhoben⁶³. Das kann freilich nur funktionieren, wenn und weil der Autor weiß, dass seine Leser Paulus kennen und verehren; er kann also die positive Bewertung von Haft und Fesselung schon voraussetzen⁶⁴. Das hier gezeichnete Paulusbild befindet sich damit zwar in Kontinuität mit dem Selbstbild, das Paulus im Philipper- und Philemonbrief sowie im 2. Korintherbrief von sich vermittelt⁶⁵, doch man sollte die Weiterentwicklung nicht unterschätzen: Formal wird in Eph 3,1 zwar die Autorität des Paulus begründet, doch diese Begründung ist nicht dazu geeignet, jemanden

⁶⁰ Cf. C. KARAKOLIS, "'A Mystery Hidden to Be Revealed?' Philological and Theological Correlations between Eph 3 and 1", *Ethik als angewandte Ekklesiologie. Der Brief an die Epheser* (ed. M. WOLTER) (Monographische Reihe von "Benedictina". Biblisch-Ökumenische Abteilung 17; Roma 2005) 65-108, 89-90.

⁶¹ Zum syntaktischen Problem von Eph 3,1 cf. v.a. G. SELLIN, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (KEK 8; Göttingen 2008) 244-245.

⁶² Cf. R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (EKK 10; Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 1982) 131; ähnlich CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 95; KARAKOLIS, "Mystery", 71-73; M. LANG, "Der erinnerte Paulus. Das Paulusbild nach Kol 1,24 – 2,5 und Eph 3,1-13", *Paulus und Paulusbilder. Konstruktion – Reflexion – Transformation* (ed. Id.) (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 31; Leipzig 2013) 153-190, 183.

⁶³ Cf. A.T. LINCOLN, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Waco, TX 1990) 175; WANSINK, *Chained in Christ*, 204; E. BEST, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; London – New York 1998) 296; ähnlich CLIVAZ, "La ru-meur", 250.

⁶⁴ Cf. BEST, *Ephesians*, 295; anders M. WOLTER, "Der Epheserbrief als nachpaulinischer Paulusbrief. Zusammenfassung", *Ethik als angewandte Ekklesiologie. Der Brief an die Epheser* (ed. Id.) (Monographische Reihe von "Benedictina". Biblisch-Ökumenische Abteilung 17; Roma 2005) 189-210, 199.

⁶⁵ So etwa J. ERNST, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an Philemon, an die Kolosser, an die Epheser* (RNT; Regensburg 1974) 326.

zu überzeugen, der Paulus etwa wegen seiner Haft für diskreditiert hielte. Die Gestalt des Paulus erscheint im Epheserbrief unangefochten, und eben darum kann es sich der Autor leisten, Haft bzw. Fesselung in Eph 3,1 als Markenzeichen des Apostels einzuführen. Dies wird durch den Artikel (ὁ δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ]) unterstrichen⁶⁶: Die Selbstbezeichnung, die sich Paulus in Phlm 1.9 aus gegebenem Anlass beigelegt hat (s.o. II.2), ist weiter reflektiert und zu einem festen Bestandteil der Erinnerung an Paulus geworden⁶⁷.

In Eph 4,1 wird dieses Markenzeichen dann paränetisch eingesetzt. Gerade als "Gefangener im Herrn" hat "Paulus" die Autorität, von den Lesern ein bestimmtes Verhalten zu verlangen⁶⁸; das betonte ἐγὼ unterstreicht dies⁶⁹. Anders als der Paulus, der den Philemonbrief schrieb, hat es dieser "Paulus" nicht nötig, um etwas zu bitten oder um Sympathie für seine Haftsituation zu werben⁷⁰. Zwar steht hier dasselbe Verb wie in Phlm 9 (παρακαλέω), doch während es dort eine Bitte bezeichnet (im Gegensatz zum ἐπιτάσσειν von Phlm 8), steht es in Eph 4,1 für eine autoritative Ermahnung⁷¹.

Am Ende des Briefes fallen die Reisepläne relativ sachlich und knapp aus, denn für den Epheserbrief ist Paulus habituell Gefangener; daher können mögliche Reisen nach einer erhofften Entlassung aus der Haft gar nicht in Betracht kommen (anders Phlm 22!). Dafür lässt der Autor ihn einen Besuch des Mitarbeiters Tychikos ankündigen (cf. dazu Phil 2,19-30). Dieses Detail macht wiederum deutlich, dass Paulus für die Leser des Epheserbriefes als dauerhaft abwesend vorgestellt wird — literarisch durch seine Haft, historisch durch

⁶⁶ Cf. ESLER, "Remember my Fetters", 233 mit n. 4.

⁶⁷ Cf. LINCOLN, *Ephesians*, 173; U. LUZ, "Der Brief an die Epheser", J. BECKER, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser* (NTD 8/1; Göttingen 1998) 105-180, 143-144; ähnlich CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 96; SELLIN, *Brief an die Epheser*, 248.

⁶⁸ Cf. LINCOLN, *Ephesians*, 234; S. BYRSKOG, "Ephesians 4:1-16 – Paraenesis and Identity Formation". *Ethik als angewandte Ekklesiologie*. Der Brief an die Epheser (ed. M. WOLTER) (Monographische Reihe von "Benedictina". Biblisch-Ökumenische Abteilung 17; Roma 2005) 109-138, 118.

⁶⁹ Cf. J. GNILKA, *Der Epheserbrief* (HTKNT 10/2; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1971) 196; SCHNACKENBURG, *Brief an die Epheser*, 164.

⁷⁰ Cf. ERNST, *Briefe*, 344; BEST, *Ephesians*, 360.

⁷¹ Zum Bedeutungsspektrum cf. *LSJ*, 1311, s.v. παρακαλέω, v.a. IV. ("demand, require") und V. ("beseech, entreat"). Für die Bedeutungsnuancen in Eph 4,1 cf. BEST, *Ephesians*, 360: "... weaker and more friendly than 'command', 'instruct' (cf. Philem 8ff)".

seinen Tod. Doch vor diesen knappen Reiseankündigungen und vor dem abschließenden Friedens- und Gnadenwunsch kommt “Paulus” noch einmal auf seine Fesseln zu sprechen (Eph 6,18-20): Er bittet um die Fürbitte der Leser, damit er “das Geheimnis des Evangeliums” freimütig (παρρησία, 6,19; παρρησιάζωμαι, 6,20) verkünden kann, wenngleich er es in Ketten (ἐν ἁλύσει, 6,20) tut. Die Wortwahl von 6,20 stellt ein veritables Oxymoron dar: Der in Ketten liegende “Paulus” bezeichnet seine Verkündigung mit dem Verb πρεσβεύω und stellt sich so als Gesandten, als Diplomaten dar, der doch eigentlich Immunität genießen müsste⁷². Diese Spannung wird jedoch im Text nicht weiter ausgewertet; das Thema der freimütigen Rede überwiegt, und so nehmen manche Auslegungen die Kette als Haftmittel in Eph 6,20 gar nicht wahr⁷³. Anders gewendet: Die Kette erscheint hier als ikonographisches Detail, das beiläufig eingefügt wird, aber fest zum etablierten Paulusbild gehört, auch wenn es Spannungen innerhalb des Bildes erzeugt: Was immer Paulus tut, er tut es in Ketten.

In terminologischer Hinsicht fällt hier auf, dass die Haftsituation des Paulus nicht mit dem eher unspezifischen, auch metonymisch zu verstehenden Wort δεσμοί/-ά bezeichnet wird, sondern ausdrücklich mit ἁλυσίς (Kette). Damit wird unmissverständlich deutlich gemacht, dass Paulus nach der Vorstellung des Epheserbriefes tatsächlich mit einer metallenen Fessel gebunden ist — und dass gerade diese die Auszeichnung des δέσμιος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] bzw. δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ ist. Die singularische Formulierung ἐν ἁλύσει wird man wohl nicht als Zahlenangabe, sondern generisch zu verstehen haben⁷⁴. Auch diese Formulierung dürfte damit als ein Element der ikonographischen Abstraktion zu verstehen sein⁷⁵: Wichtig ist, dass zu Paulus eine Kette gehört; die näheren Details der Fesselung sind von geringerem Interesse.

Sollte man hier von einer Verklärung der Kette sprechen? Immerhin gibt der Epheserbrief keinen Hinweis darauf, dass die Kette für “Paulus” ein Problem darstellt. Sie hat sich aus ihrer realen Bedeutung

⁷² Cf. dazu LINCOLN, *Ephesians*, 454; CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 102; auch SELLIN, *Brief an die Epheser*, 486-487.

⁷³ So etwa MAIER, *Picturing Paul*, 106, die Kette als “ambassadorial chain” betrachtet — was immer das sein mag.

⁷⁴ Cf. BEST, *Ephesians*, 609.

⁷⁵ Cf. ERNST, *Briefe*, 402; LINCOLN, *Ephesians*, 454.

als Haftmittel gelöst und ist zum Attribut des Paulus geworden, der eben als Gefangener in Erinnerung bleibt. Eine entfernte Parallele dazu könnte man, am Rande bemerkt, bei Agrippa I. sehen, von dem Josephus berichtet, er sei unter Kaiser Tiberius in Haft gehalten worden, doch der neue Kaiser Gaius (Caligula) habe ihn freigelassen und ihm u.a. (als Haftentschädigung?) eine goldene Kette geschenkt mit demselben Gewicht wie die eiserne, mit der er während seiner Haft gefesselt war. Diese Kette habe Agrippa I. sodann als Weihegeschenk im Jerusalemer Tempel ausgestellt (cf. Jos. Ant. 18,237; 19,294). Eine ähnliche Tendenz ist im Paulusbild des Epheserbriefes sicher gegeben, doch die Kette fungiert nach wie vor auch als Element der pseudepigraphischen Fiktion; dieser Aspekt ist nicht zu vernachlässigen.

Die Gebetsbitte am Ende des Epheserbriefes hat eine deutliche Parallele zu dem Bild, das Lukas in Apg 28 entwirft: Auch dort betont Paulus, dass er eine Kette trägt (τὴν ἄλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι, 28,20), und doch kann er freimütig (μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας) und ungehindert verkündigen und lehren ⁷⁶. Durch die Stichworte ἄλυσις und παρρησία wird in Eph 6,18-20 das Szenario evoziert, das in Apg 28,16-31 narrativ entfaltet ist. Auch darin zeigt sich, dass der Epheserbrief schon an einer entwickelten Paulus-Ikonographie partizipiert.

3. Der 2 Timotheusbrief

Diese ikonographische bzw. hagiographische Stilisierung des Paulus als des in Ketten liegenden Verkündigers wurde in der Paulusrezeption des späten 1. und frühen 2. Jahrhunderts nicht allgemein als völlig unproblematisch gesehen. Der Autor des 2. Timotheusbriefes zeigt ein Problembewusstsein, das in der Paulus-Ikonographie des Kolosser- und Epheserbriefes nicht anzutreffen ist: Haft und Kette sind nach wie vor etwas, dessen man sich eigentlich schämen müsste ⁷⁷; mit entsprechendem Nachdruck wird in 2 Tim 1,8.16 "Timotheos" — und damit der Leser — aufgerufen, sich des inhaftierten und angekettenen Paulus gerade nicht zu schämen. Dem Verfasser ist bewusst, dass die Haftsituation ein κακοπαθεῖν ist (2 Tim 1,8; 2,9), und gerade dazu wird "Timotheos" mit aufgefordert (2 Tim 1,8).

⁷⁶ So auch LINCOLN, *Ephesians*, 455; PERVO, *Making of Paul*, 76.

⁷⁷ Cf. WANSINK, *Chained in Christ*, 202-203; zum zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund cf. RAPSKE, *Paul in Roman Custody*, 288-291; KRAUSE, *Gefängnisse im Römischen Reich*, 66.

Wenn man die Paulusstilisierung in den deuteropaulinischen Schriften als lineare Entwicklung auffasste, müsste man also sagen, dass sie in den Pastoralbriefen, wenigstens hinsichtlich des Gefangenschaftsmotivs, weniger weit entwickelt ist. Es erscheint jedoch angemessener, verschiedene Zweige der Paulusrezeption anzunehmen. Der Kolosser- und Epheserbrief gehören demnach einem bestimmten Traditionsstrang an, die Pastoralbriefe einem anderen: In den Pastoralbriefen, speziell im 2. Timotheusbrief, werden Haft und Kette als solche und in ihrer Beziehung zu Paulus zum Thema; die christologische Interpretation des Leidens einschließlich der Haft, wie man sie im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief antrifft, ist hier nicht zu finden ⁷⁸. Der Topos vom Paulus als dem "Gefangenen Christi" scheint dem Autor geläufig zu sein (hier dürfte die aus Phlm 1.9 entwickelte Paulustradition rezipiert sein, wie sie, in anderer Ausformung, auch im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief anzutreffen ist ⁷⁹), doch er wird eher beiläufig eingespielt (2 Tim 1,8). Daher ist nun nach den Gründen für diese umsichtigere, problembewusste Rezeption des Gefangenschaftsmotivs zu fragen. Claire Clivaz nimmt an, dass es im Umfeld des Autors unterschwellige Vorbehalte gegenüber Paulus gab und dass die bekannte Tatsache seiner Gefangenschaft ein Grund war, das Wirken des Paulus überhaupt in Frage zu stellen ⁸⁰. Damit wäre der Autor des 2. Timotheusbriefes mit derselben Problematik konfrontiert wie Paulus selbst in Phil 1,12-17.

Angesichts dieser Problematik will der Autor allem Anschein nach das Paradox bewältigen, dass "Paulus", der für eine befreiende, frohe Botschaft steht, zugleich als jemand in Erinnerung ist, der einen beachtlichen Teil seiner Wirkungszeit in Gefängnissen bzw. in Ketten zubrachte ⁸¹. Wenn diese entehrende, demütigende Situation ein elementarer und nicht zu verschweigender Bestandteil der Erinnerung an Paulus war, dann stand der Autor der Pastoralbriefe vor einem Problem: Sein Anliegen war es eigentlich, das von Paulus geprägte Christentum als etwas darzustellen, das mit den Wertvorstellungen der umgebenden hellenistischen bzw. römischen Mehrheitsgesellschaft

⁷⁸ Cf. MARGUERAT, "Paul après Paul", 332-333; ähnlich KELHOFFER, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power*, 85-86.

⁷⁹ Cf. dazu auch SCHRÖTER, "Kirche im Anschluss an Paulus", 91.

⁸⁰ Cf. CLIVAZ, "La rumeur", 250-251; auch CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 108-109.113-114 mit Hinweis auf 2 Tim 1,15.

⁸¹ Cf. L. OBERLINNER, *Die Pastoralbriefe*. Zweite Folge. Kommentar zum Zweiten Timotheusbrief (HTKNT 11/2/2; Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1995) 79.

vereinbar war und keinen Anlass zu Verdächtigungen oder übler Nachrede bot (cf. etwa 1 Tim 2,2; 6,1; Tit 2,5)⁸². Mit einem inhaftierten und gefesselten Paulus war das nicht leicht zu bewerkstelligen. Daher führt der Autor die Haftsituation nicht sofort zu Beginn des Schreibens ein, sondern erinnert “Timotheos” zuerst an dessen Einsetzung ins Amt (2 Tim 1,5). Erst in einem zweiten Schritt und darauf aufbauend (οὖν), macht er es ihm gewissermaßen zur dienstlichen Pflicht, sich des gefangenen Paulus, der sich als “sein (sc. des Herrn) Gefangener” vorstellt, nicht zu schämen. Von Ketten ist an diesem Punkt noch nicht die Rede; das Paulusbild ähnelt dem, das Paulus selbst im Philemonbrief von sich zeichnet. “Paulus” spricht zunächst allgemein von seinem Leiden (ταῦτα πάσχω, 1,12), für das er sich nicht schämt. Erst im zweiten Anlauf — nach dem hymnischen Lob der Gnade Gottes (1,9-10) und der Aufforderung, als treuer Verkündiger Paulus nachzuahmen (1,11-14) — wird dann in 2 Tim 1,16 die Kette als Emblem der Gefangenschaft eingeführt, eingebettet in Lob und Fürbitte für Onesiphoros (bzw. sein Haus). Ein Element verbindet indes den Bericht über dessen Leistungen (1,16-18) mit dem Appell an “Timotheos” (1,8) und der Selbstaussage des Paulus (1,11-12): Das Sich-Nicht-Schämen (μὴ ἐπαισχύνηθης, 1,8; οὐκ ἐπαισχύνομαι, 1,12; οὐκ ἐπαισχύνη, 1,16). “Timotheos” soll sich nicht für das Zeugnis des Herrn und Paulus, seinen Gefangenen, schämen (1,8), weil Paulus selbst sich nicht für das schämt, was er erleidet (1,12), und auch Onesiphoros sich nicht für die Kette des Paulus geschämt hat (1,16)⁸³. Im Verlauf von 2 Tim 1,6-18 wird also der schon bekannte Topos von Paulus als dem Gefangenen Christi Jesu (Phlm 1.9) aufgegriffen und in seinen Implikationen entfaltet: Wenn der Autor die Kette des Paulus eigens erwähnt, bewahrt er diesen Topos vor hagiographischer Verklärung und macht anschaulich, welches Problem darin steckt. Der eigentliche Anstoß, dass man sich für einen gefangenen und angeketteten Apostel eigentlich schämen müsste, wird offensiv benannt und im Blick auf lobenswerte Vorbilder — das Haus des Onesiphoros — ansatzweise bewältigt. Anders als im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief, bietet der 2. Timotheus-

⁸² Cf. dazu etwa G. HÄFNER, “Die Pastoralbriefe (1 Tim/2 Tim/Tit)”, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (eds. M. EBNER – S. SCHREIBER) (KStTh 6; Stuttgart 2013) 456-479, 473.

⁸³ Nach MAIER, *Picturing Paul*, 149 sollen beide Passagen zeigen, dass Paulus sich in der Haft auf seine Unterstützer verlassen kann.

brief jedoch keine positive, gar soteriologische Deutung der Haftsituation, sondern beschränkt sich darauf, den mit der Fesselung verbundenen Ehrverlust abzumildern.

In der Argumentation des 2. Timotheusbriefes geht es aber nicht nur darum, den gefangenen Paulus gegen Vorbehalte ob seiner durch die Haft beschädigten Reputation in Schutz zu nehmen: Wenn dies der Fall wäre, wäre die (amts-) paränetische Verwendung dieses Motivs nicht erklärlich: "Timotheos", der Adressat, wird ja nicht nur aufgefordert, die Haftsituation des Paulus als nicht ehrenrührig zu betrachten. Der gefangene Paulus steht sogar auf einer Stufe mit dem von ihm verkündeten "Zeugnis unseres Herrn"; für beide soll sich "Timotheos" nicht schämen, doch vor allem soll er auch selbst bereit sein, im Dienst für dieses Zeugnis am Leiden des Apostels teilzunehmen (συγκακοπάησον, 2 Tim 1,8; 2,3)⁸⁴. Der mit Ketten gefesselte und Übles erleidende Apostel wird damit für die Gegenwart des Autors zum Vorbild⁸⁵. Möglichen Einwänden begegnet der Autor in 2 Tim 2,9: In Christus (vgl. Phil 1,13!) erleidet Paulus sogar⁸⁶ Fesseln *wie* ein Übeltäter (ὡς κακοῦργος); das impliziert, dass Paulus natürlich kein Übeltäter ist⁸⁷. Zu dieser entrüsteten Distanzierung passt der trotzige Nachsatz: "Aber das Wort Gottes ist nicht gefesselt". Die Integrität der Botschaft wird damit von der konkreten Lebenssituation des Verkündigers gelöst: Paulus mag sich in Haft befinden und schlussendlich hingerichtet werden, die von ihm verkündete Botschaft wird dadurch nicht diskreditiert⁸⁸. Dabei geht es nicht um ein "Qualitätssiegel" für die Verkündigung

⁸⁴ Cf. dazu Y. REDALIÉ, *Paul après Paul. Le temps, le salut, la morale selon les épîtres à Timothée et à Tite* (MoBi 31; Genève 1994) 114-115.

⁸⁵ Cf. N. BROX, *Die Pastoralbriefe*. 1 Timotheus, 2 Timotheus, Titus (RNT; Regensburg 1969) 243; OBERLINNER, *Pastoralbriefe* 2, 36; A. WEISER, *Der zweite Brief an Timotheus* (EKK 16/1; Düsseldorf – Neukirchen-Vluyn 2003) 112.123; ähnlich auch KELHOFFER, *Persecution, Persuasion and Power*, 82-83.

⁸⁶ Die Präposition μέχρι ist in 2 Tim 2,9 nicht lokal zu verstehen, sondern quantitativ auf das Ausmaß der Leiden bezogen; cf. I.H. MARSHALL, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh 1999) 736.

⁸⁷ Cf. MARSHALL, *Pastoral Epistles*, 736; auch CASSIDY, *Paul in Chains*, 108.111.

⁸⁸ Cf. BROX, *Pastoralbriefe*, 242-243; MARSHALL, *Pastoral Epistles*, 736-737.

des Paulus ⁸⁹, sondern vorrangig um den Kontrast (ἀλλὰ) zwischen dem gefesselten Apostel und dem freien Gotteswort.

Angesichts dessen mag man überlegen, ob die Christen, an welche die Pastoralbriefe gerichtet sind, unter Druck von außen standen (man könnte auch sagen: in einer Verfolgungssituation) ⁹⁰. Dann würde die Aufforderung, gegenüber der Mehrheitsgesellschaft nicht negativ aufzufallen (1 Tim 6,1; Tit 2,5), einen sehr konkreten Hintergrund erhalten. Diese Konzeption entspricht dann annähernd der des 1. Petrusbriefes, der seinerseits Konformität mit den Standards der Mehrheitsgesellschaft anmahnt (1 Petr 2,11 – 3,7), aber zugleich und trotz allen Wohlverhaltens das Leiden „als Christ“ (1 Petr 4,16) als eine reale Möglichkeit darstellt.

Von einer Stilisierung der Fesseln bzw. Ketten des Paulus, wie wir sie in der Apostelgeschichte, im Kolosserbrief und im Epheserbrief antreffen, ist der Autor des 2. Timotheusbriefes also weit entfernt. Die Ikonographie hat hier keine vergleichbare Eigendynamik entwickelt. Für diesen Autor ist die Kette, so scheint es, nicht nur ein ikonographisches Attribut, sondern ein auch textpragmatisch überaus bedeutsames Stück der Erinnerung an Paulus. Wenn das von Paulus geprägte Christentum in der Mehrheitsgesellschaft akzeptabel sein sollte, stellte diese Erinnerung ein Problem dar, wie der Umgang damit in 2 Tim 1,8.12.15-18; 2,3.9 zeigt. Es ist aber unwahrscheinlich, dass sich der Autor des 2. Timotheusbriefes ohne Grund dieses Problem einhandelte. Er äußert sich zwar nicht so konkret wie der 1. Petrusbrief (etwa 1 Petr 4,12-19), doch die problembewusste Darstellung des Paulus als Identifikationsangebot (συγκακοπάθησον 2 Tim 1,8; 2,3) lässt vermuten, dass im Hintergrund eine ähnlich prekäre Situation steht, die mit Hilfe der abrufbaren Erinnerung an Paulus als Leidenden und Gefangenen bewältigt werden soll.

IV. Ergebnis

Dass Paulus Gefangener war und Fesseln trug, war von Anfang an fester Bestandteil der Erinnerung an Paulus; nach 1 Clem 5,6 hat diese Stilisierung des Paulus als des Apostels in Fesseln schon früh ein beachtliches Maß erreicht. Auch die Darstellung der Apostel-

⁸⁹ So WEISER, *Der zweite Brief an Timotheus*, 168.

⁹⁰ So etwa ESLER, „Remember my Fetters“, 236-237.

geschichte bezeugt diese Stilisierung, denn Lukas fügt das Motiv der Fesseln auch gegen die erzählerische Plausibilität in das Bild ein, das er von Paulus zeichnet (cf. Apg 21,33; 26,29; 28,20). Sofern man die Darstellung des Lukas als literarisches Bild verstehen will, erweisen sich die Fesseln des Paulus als ikonographisches Element, man könnte auch sagen: als Attribut des heiligen Paulus.

Diese Ikonographie hat ihre Wurzeln bei Paulus selbst: Im Philipperbrief verlieh Paulus seiner Haftsituation eine positive Deutung, indem er die Fesseln, die er in der Haft zu tragen hatte, als "in Christus" getragene interpretierte (Phil 1,13) und mit dieser Deutung anscheinend Zustimmung fand. Der Philemonbrief spricht dafür, dass sich dieses Deutungsmuster bewährte, denn hier ist "Gefangener Christi Jesu" (Phlm 1.9) zu einem Titel des Paulus geworden.

In den deuteropaulinischen Briefen wird diese Selbststilisierung des Paulus aufgegriffen und weitergeführt. Der Kolosserbrief führt Paulus nicht nur allgemein als Leidenden ein (Kol 1,23-29), sondern setzt selbstverständlich voraus, dass der "Paulus", der hier einen Brief verfasst, sich in Fesseln befindet (Kol 4,3) — eben diese Fesseln werden zum Markenzeichen des Apostels, an das die Leser und Hörer sich erinnern sollen (Kol 4,18). Der Epheserbrief geht — im Anschluss an Phlm 9 — noch einen Schritt weiter: Als "der Gefangene Christi [Jesu]" (Eph 3,1; ähnlich 4,1) kann "Paulus" autoritativ Anweisungen geben. In Eph 6,18-20 kommen dann — wie in Apg 28,17-31 — zwei Dimensionen des Paulusbildes zusammen: Verkündiger und Gefangener. Der Gebetswunsch evoziert ein Gesamtbild von Paulus, der in bzw. trotz seiner Kette (ἐν ἀλύσει) freimütig redet (παρρησιάζομαι). Die Kette wird als Attribut geradezu verklärt. Damit erreicht der Epheserbrief — wenngleich auf anderem Wege — die gleiche ikonographische Komplexität wie die Apostelgeschichte. Der 2. Timotheusbrief beschreitet dem gegenüber einen anderen Weg. Auch hier ist die Kette zwar ein festes Attribut des Paulus, doch von Verklärung ist wenig zu merken. Diese Paulus-Erinnerung verklärt den Apostel nicht so, wie es im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief geschieht, sondern sie bleibt relativ realistisch und problembewusst. Dass Paulus in Haft war, ist aber auch hier ein konstitutiver Bestandteil des zu tradierenden Paulusbildes.

Für die Frage nach zeitgeschichtlichen Gründen für dieses spezielle Interesse an der Haftsituation des Paulus ließen sich indes keine allzu klaren Hinweise gewinnen. Die Ikonologie hinter diesen Paulusbildern wird also nicht immer völlig klar. In mehreren Fällen ist

dieses Element der Erinnerung an Paulus sogar kontraproduktiv: Die Apostelgeschichte stellt Paulus sonst mit höchst respektablen Verbindungen zur Oberschicht dar, aber sie integriert den Gefangenensstatus in dieses Bild, ohne ihn zu problematisieren. Auch im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief entsteht nicht der Eindruck, dass die Darstellung des inhaftierten und gefesselten Paulus auf ein aktuelles Problem, etwa eine Verfolgungssituation, reagiert. Das einzige Problem, das diesem Paulusbild zugrunde zu liegen scheint, ist die Entzogenheit des Apostels, die pseudepigraphie Schreiben nötig macht. In den Pastoralbriefen ist hingegen die Erinnerung an den gefesselten Paulus selbst ein Problem, wenn hier zu Konformität mit den Standards der Mehrheitsgesellschaft aufgerufen wird. Wenn die Pastoralbriefe ein Handlungsmodell für den Umgang mit Druck von außen bieten, dann besteht es eher darin, Konfrontation zu vermeiden und gar nicht erst in eine Situation zu geraten, wie sie für "Paulus" vorausgesetzt wird. Paulus ist zwar in der Erinnerung als Gefangener präsent, aber das bedeutet nicht, dass sein Dasein als Gefangener unmittelbare Vorbildfunktion hat — mittelbar könnte dem Autor das Geschick des Paulus freilich als reale Möglichkeit vor Augen stehen, ähnlich wie im 1. Petrusbrief. Methodisch ist hier freilich einzuschränken, dass die jeweilige Darstellung des Paulus als Gefangenen nicht das entscheidende Kriterium ist, um den zeitgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der hier besprochenen Schriften zu rekonstruieren. Es ist nicht gesagt, dass ein Autor, der unter Druck von außen stand, seinen "Paulus" notwendig so darstellen musste, wie es im 2. Timotheusbrief der Fall ist. Das Paulusbild fungiert als ein Indiz neben anderen.

Dass die Paulusrezeption bzw. die Erinnerung an Paulus im 1. bzw. frühen 2. Jahrhundert sehr unterschiedliche Formen annehmen konnte, ist mittlerweile ein Gemeinplatz. Die Vielfalt der Paulus-Erinnerungen wird sogar noch eindrucksvoller, wenn man die Ignatianen (v.a. *IgnEph* 3,1; *IgnTrall* 3,3 – 4,2; *IgnRöm* 4,3)⁹¹ mit heranzieht, ganz zu schweigen von den Paulusakten. Umso bemerkenswerter erscheint es, dass das Faktum der Fesseln bzw. Ketten in all diesen Erinnerungsbildern ein festes Element der Paulus-Ikonographie ist. Die Fesseln werden in den einzelnen Texten in unterschiedlicher Weise thematisiert; ihr paränetischer Wert hält sich

⁹¹ Cf. etwa A. MERZ, *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus*. Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Paulusbriefe (NTOA 52; Göttingen – Fribourg 2004) 151.

meistens in Grenzen, aber auf keinen Fall dürfen sie im Paulusbild fehlen. Mit seiner Entscheidung, seine Fesseln im Philipper- und Philemonbrief offensiv zu thematisieren, hat Paulus eine Tradition angestoßen, die in der frühchristlichen Literatur und darüber hinaus enorm wirkmächtig wurde: Die Deuteropaulinen entfalten sie weiter, die Apostelgeschichte kann sie als Deutungskontext bzw. Interpretant ihres Paulusbildes voraussetzen — und auch im Logo des *Anno Paolino* gehört die Kette zu Paulus.

Theologische Fakultät
der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Arbeitsbereich Neutestamentliche Literatur und Exegese
D-79085 Freiburg im Breisgau

Stephan WITETSCHEK

SUMMARY

Chains or bonds are a standard feature of representations of Paul in early Christianity. In the narrative of Acts 21–28 they appear to be an element of literary iconography employed by “Luke the painter”. This iconography begins with Paul himself, who interpreted his bonds as worn “in Christ” (Phil 1,13) and himself as “prisoner of Christ Jesus” (Phlm 1.9). The Deutero-Pauline Epistles follow suit: In Colossians and Ephesians the bonds appear as the iconographical attribute, while in 2 Timothy they are perceived and tackled as a problem. In any event, Paul is remembered as the Apostle in fetters.

ANIMADVERSIONES

How the Sheep of Judah Became Fish: Habakkuk 1,14 and the Davidic Monarchy

I. The Complaint of Habakkuk 1,14

In Hab 1,2-4, Habakkuk or his tradents (hereafter simply Habakkuk) complain about injustice, lawlessness, the oppression of the righteous by the wicked, and God's seeming toleration of it all. Following Habakkuk's complaint, God announces that he is sending the Chaldeans to sweep over the land in a destructive rampage (1,5-11). Following God's announcement, Habakkuk complains that by using the Chaldeans as an instrument of judgment God uses those who are wicked to punish those who are more righteous, and he bemoans the destructive behavior of the Chaldeans and God's seeming toleration of it all (1,12-17).

The mention of the Chaldeans (i.e., the Babylonians) and of the destruction they bring indicates that these passages in Habakkuk 1 are concerned with the events of the late 600s/early 500s BCE — the time of the emergence and flourishing of the Neo-Babylonian Empire and the final years of the Kingdom of Judah ¹.

Trying to tie the passages in Habakkuk 1 to specific dates, reigns, and circumstances within the general time frame of the late 600s/early 500s

¹ R.L. SMITH, *Micah-Malachi* (WBC 32; Waco, TX 1984) 94-95; J.J.M. ROBERTS, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (OTL; Louisville, KY 1991) 82-84; F.I. ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25; New York 2001) 22-27; O.P. ROBERTSON, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI 1990) 30, 34-38; M.A. SWEENEY, *The Twelve Prophets* (ed. D.W. COTTER) (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN 2000) II, 453-56, 461, 464-65; M.H. FLOYD, *Minor Prophets. Part 2* (FOTL 22; Grand Rapids, MI 2000) 84, 87, 100, 107; F.F. BRUCE, "Habakkuk", *The Minor Prophets. An Exegetical and Expository Commentary* (ed. T.E. MCCOMISKEY) (Grand Rapids, MI 1993) II, 831, 834, 847; C.-A. KELLER, "Habacuc", *Michée, Nahoum, Habacuc, Sophonie* (eds. R. VUILLEUMIER – C.-A. KELLER) (CAT 11b; Genève ²1990) 139-140, 148-149; W. BAILEY, "Habakkuk", *Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah* (eds. K.L. BARKER – W. BAILEY) (NAC 20; Nashville, TN 1999) 246, 259-260; L. PERLITT, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania* (ATD 25/I; Göttingen 2004) 41-42; R.D. HAAK, *Habakkuk* (VTS 44; Leiden 1992), 130-155; K. ELLIGER, *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten II. Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Zacharia, Maleachi* (ATD 25; Göttingen 1964) 23-25.

has proved to be extremely difficult. As has been observed, “... the language [in Habakkuk 1] is elusive in that it is somewhat specific, but not precise enough to be attached to any identifiable historical event; at the same time, it is somewhat general, but not abstract enough to be detached from historical particulars”². There is, however, one detail in Habakkuk 1, a detail which has gone unnoticed, which does tie a particular passage to a specific event during the late 600s/early 500s.

As part of his second complaint about God’s actions (Hab 1,12-17), Habakkuk makes the following statement to God³:

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 1,14a | You have made people like fish (דגים), |
| 1,14b | like other aquatic animals (רמש) that have no ruler over them. |

The characterization of fish and other aquatic animals as being leaderless has been understood as a reference to their helplessness and vulnerability at the hands of fisherfolk, a situation which is described in the verses that follow (1,15-17)⁴. And since the statement in 1,14 is in the form of a human/animal simile, the leaderlessness of fish and other aquatic animals (hereafter simply aquatic animals) has been understood as a reference to the helplessness and vulnerability of people at the hands of the Babylonians (i.e., the wicked fisherfolk in 1,15-17).

While it is undoubtedly true that the leaderlessness of aquatic animals was meant to convey helplessness and vulnerability, there is another nu-

² ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 174.

³ The רמש-animals in 1,14b have been variously identified as non-fish aquatic animals, land animals that crawl/creep, or both. See R. WHITEKETTLE, “Like a Fish and Shrimp Out of Water: Identifying the *Dāg* and *Remeš* Animals of Habakkuk 1:14”, *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 24 (2014) 491-503. Everything said in this paper holds true regardless of which identification is followed.

⁴ BAILEY, “Habakkuk”, 315; SWEENEY, *The Twelve*, 468; BRUCE, “Habakkuk”, 854; ROBERTSON, *The Books*, 162; SMITH, *Micah*, 104; FLOYD, *Minor Prophets*, 109; ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 184; PERLITT, *Die Propheten*, 60; J. GOLDINGAY, “Habakkuk”, *Minor Prophets II* (eds. J. GOLDINGAY – P.J. SCALISE) (Understanding the Bible Commentary Series; Grand Rapids, MI 2012) 64; R.D. PATTERSON, *Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah* (Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary; Chicago, IL 1991) 159; M. DELCOR, “Habacuc”, *Les petits prophètes. II: Michée, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonie, Aggée, Zacharie, Malachie* (eds. A. DEISSLER – M. DELCOR) (SB[PC] Tome 8, Partie 1; Paris 1964) 412; C.F. KEIL, *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, Volume 2 (tran. J. MARTIN) (K&D 25; Grand Rapids, MI 1951) 66; D. DEDEN, *De Kleine Profeten* (Roermond en Maaseik 1953) 261; B. DUHM, *Das Buch Habakuk*. Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung (Tübingen 1906) 35.

ance to their leaderlessness which has been overlooked. Aquatic animals are leaderless, not because they have a leader who is absent or inept (hereafter episodic leaderlessness), but because they are animals which simply never have any leaders (hereafter structural leaderlessness). Thus, Habakkuk was complaining that God had made the human targets of Babylonian aggression to be like structurally leaderless animals.

It might be thought that the structural leaderlessness of aquatic animals is without significance for the meaning of Hab 1,14. After all, it is the helplessness and vulnerability of aquatic animals which is illustrated in the verses that follow (1,15-17). Several things, however, can be noted.

First, when Israelite authors used animal imagery to talk about human leadership they typically used sheep imagery to do so⁵. For example, they talked about shepherds (leaders) guiding and caring for their sheep (people), and about sheep (people) following their shepherds (leaders)⁶. By mentioning aquatic animals in 1,14 rather than sheep, Habakkuk deviated from the standard way that Israelite authors talked about human leadership. This suggests that Habakkuk mentioned aquatic animals because they conveyed something about leadership which sheep did not.

Second, Habakkuk describes how the leaderless animals/people are captured with hooks and nets in 1,15-17. The capture of animals/people with hooks, nets, and snares is mentioned in other Israelite and ancient Near Eastern texts. In those texts, however, the leaderlessness of the captives is not mentioned⁷. Thus, by mentioning leaderlessness in 1,14-17, Habakkuk deviated from the standard way that the capture of animals/people with hooks and nets was talked about. This suggests that

⁵ On shepherd/sheep imagery in Israelite and Ancient Near Eastern thought, see L. RYKEN – J.C. WILHOUT – T. LONGMAN III (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Downers Grove, IL 1998) 292-293 s.v. “flock”; 630 s.v. “pasture”; 782-785 s.v. “sheep, shepherd”; B.A. FOREMAN, *Animal Metaphors and the People of Israel in the Book of Jeremiah* (FRLANT 238; Göttingen 2011) 35-106; Y.S. CHAE, *Jesus as the Eschatological Good Shepherd*. Studies in the Old Testament, Second Temple Judaism, and in the Gospel of Matthew (WUNT 216; Tübingen 2006) 19-94; W. BAXTER, *Israel's Only Shepherd*. Matthew's Shepherd Motif and His Social Setting (JSNTS 457; London 2012) 43-58; J. WILLITTS, *Matthew's Shepherd-King*. In Search of ‘The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel’ (BZNW 147; Berlin 2007) 51-72.

⁶ E.g., Isa 40,11; Jer 3,15; Ezek 34; Hos 4,16; Amos 3,12; Mic 2,12; Zeph 2,6-7; Zech 9,16.

⁷ E.g., Isa 8,14-15; Jer 5,26; Lam 1,13; Ezek 12,13; Hos 7,12; Amos 3,5; Mic 7,2. For the ancient Near Eastern textual record, see, e.g., D. BODI, *The Book of Ezekiel and the Poem of Erra* (OBO 104; Freiburg – Göttingen 1991) 162-182; O. KEEL, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World*. Ancient Near Eastern Iconography and the Book of Psalms (trans. T.J. HALLETT) (New York 1985) 89-95.

there was something significant about the leaderlessness of aquatic animals which Habakkuk wanted to convey.

Third, when talking about a leadership crisis, Israelite authors talked about absent or bad leaders (which they characterized as shepherds) and about people (which they characterized as sheep) who had gone astray from their leaders or who were left helpless and vulnerable by their leaders⁸. Thus, they thought of a leadership crisis as a matter of episodic leaderlessness and used animals which illustrated that. When Habakkuk talked about a leadership crisis in 1,14, he deviated from the standard way that Israelite authors did this and used animals which are structurally leaderless. This suggests that he considered the precise nature of the leaderlessness he was complaining about to be of importance.

Fourth, structural leaderlessness in animals is mentioned in the Israelite textual record (Prov 6,6-8; 30,27). Thus, the Israelites, or at least some of them, recognized that there were different types of leaderlessness in the animal world. Since the unusual mention of aquatic animals and leaderlessness in 1,14 indicates careful and deliberate thought about these things (see the preceding three points), it is reasonable to assume that Habakkuk was one of the people in Israel who recognized that there were different types of leaderlessness in the animal world, and that he recognized that the leaderlessness of aquatic animals was structural and not episodic.

Taken together, these four points make a robust case that the structural leaderlessness of aquatic animals was integral to the meaning of Hab 1,14. Assuming this, what must be determined is the human situation which Habakkuk was complaining about in 1,14.


II. What the Complaint is About

In order to identify the human situation which the complaint in Hab 1,14 was about, several things must be kept in mind. First, by complaining that a group of people had been made structurally leaderless, Habakkuk was complaining, not that the people now had absent or inept leadership, but that they now had no governance system at all. Second, the group of people that had been made structurally leaderless ends up under the governance and control of the Babylonians (1,15-17). Structural leaderlessness, then, was a characteristic of the group itself, not of the group's relationship to those outside the group. Third, since Habakkuk understood that the Babylonians were God's instrument of judgment (1,12), the state of structural leaderlessness was brought about by the actions of the Babylonians. Fourth, the fisherfolk remove the aquatic animals from the water

⁸ E.g., Isa 13,14; Jer 10,21; Ezek 34; Mic 5,7 (ET 5,8); Nah 3,18; Zech 10,2.

(1,15), which is an image of deportation. The creation of a state of structural leaderlessness was, therefore, accompanied by deportation. Fifth, Habakkuk’s thought in Habakkuk 1 was centered around Judah and its people: 1) he referred to God by the covenantal name YHWH (1,2.12), and as “Holy One” and “Rock” (1,12) — common Israelite epithets for God; 2) he was concerned about justice, the Law, and righteousness (1,4.13) — integral elements of Israelite covenantal thought; 3) he was told by God to look at the nations (1,5), indicating that he was mentally situated within Judah, outside of which were the nations. Thus, although Habakkuk was concerned about the effect of Babylonian aggression on non-Judahites (1,17), it was Judah and its people which were foremost in his mind, and around which his thoughts were centered.

Turning then to the matter of when the people of Judah, through the actions of the Babylonians, were deported, and as a group entered a state of structural leaderlessness, the following chart shows some of the fundamental aspects of the political situation in the land of Judah during the late 600s/early 500s BCE ⁹:

| <i>date</i> | 640-609 | 609 | 609-598 | 598-597 | 597-586 | 586-586? 582? |
|--|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| <i>authority figure in Judah</i> | Josiah | Jehoahaz (Shallum) | Jehoiakim (Eliakim) | Jehoiachin (Jeconiah) (Coniah) | Zedekiah (Mattaniah) | Gedaliah |
| <i>lineage of authority figure</i> | David | David | David | David | David | Shaphan/Ahikam |
| <i>position of authority figure</i> | King | King | King | King | King | Over the People |
| <i>administrative center</i> | Jerusalem | Jerusalem | Jerusalem | Jerusalem | Jerusalem | Mizpah |
| <i>state structure in Judah</i> | Kingdom of Judah | Kingdom of Judah | Kingdom of Judah | Kingdom of Judah | Kingdom of Judah | Babylonian Empire  |
| <i>deportation of Judahites to Babylon</i> | | | | 597 | 586 | 582 |

Prior to 586, the people of Judah had their own political system which was centered around the Davidic monarchy and its administrative apparatus. Those living in the land of Judah prior to 586 were directly governed by this system, even when they were dominated by foreign nations (the Assyrians, Egyptians, and Babylonians), or when a foreign power determined which member of the Davidic lineage would be on the throne (Egypt/Jehoiakim; Babylon/Zedekiah), or when the reigning Davidic

⁹ There is debate about some of the dates of these reigns. See, e.g., J. BRIGHT, *A History of Israel*. With an Introduction and Appendix by W.P. BROWN (Louisville, KY – London ⁴2000) 316-339, 493-494; J.M. MILLER – J.H. HAYES, *A History of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Louisville, KY – London ²2006) 223, 454-487. It is not clear how long Gedaliah was in office before he was assassinated.

monarch was weak or corrupt. And the people who were deported to Babylon in 597 — King Jehoiachin, members of the royal household, and members of the elite — would have thought of themselves as a (displaced) part of the Davidic polity, which was still in operation back in their homeland.

In 586, however, the Babylonians brought the Davidic polity to an end, established a different political apparatus in Judah, and deported a portion of the Judahite population to Babylon¹⁰. From that moment on, those living in the land of Judah were no longer under the authority of their own leaders and no longer members of their own polity. And for the Judahites who had been deported, whether in 597 or 586, there was no Davidic polity of which they could consider themselves to be (displaced) members.

In sum, beginning in 586, the people who lived in the land of Judah, and those who had been deported to Babylon, had no political leaders, political system, or political identity of their own. Thus, Habakkuk's complaint in 1,14, that God had made the group of people who were the targets of Babylonian aggression structurally leaderless, referred to the cataclysm which took place in 586, when the native political system in Judah — the Davidic monarchy and its administrative apparatus — ceased to exist, and the people of Judah were politically absorbed into the vast net of the Babylonian Empire.

¹⁰ On Gedaliah's function, see J. WEINBERG, "Gedaliah, the Son of Ahikam in Mizpah: His Status and Role, Supporters and Opponents", *ZAW* 119 (2007) 356-368; K-D. SCHUNK, "Die Funktion Gedaljas und der Status des Landes Juda unter Nebukadnezar II", *Geschichte Israels und deuteronomistisches Geschichtsdenken*. Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Winfried Theil (eds. P. MOMMER – A. SCHERER) (AOAT 380; Münster 2010) 259-264; P.-A. BEAULIEU, "History of Israel 6: Babylonian Period", *Dictionary of the Old Testament Historical Books* (eds. B.T. ARNOLD – H.G.M. WILLIAMSON) (Downers Grove, IL 2005) 483. It is unclear how the Babylonians governed the area of Judah after Gedaliah's assassination. For analyses of the situation in the area of Judah and among those taken to Babylon, see O. LIPSCHITS, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem*. Judah under Babylonian Rule (Winona Lake, IN 2005); MILLER – HAYES, *A History*, 478-497; D. VANDERHOOF, "Babylonian Strategies of Imperial Control in the West: Royal Practice and Rhetoric", *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (eds. O. LIPSCHITS – J. BLENKINSOPP) (Winona Lake, IN 2003) 235-262; R. ALBERTZ, *Israel in Exile*. The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E. (trans. D. GREEN) (Studies in Biblical Literature 3; Atlanta, GA 2003) 45-111; J.J. AHN, *Exile as Forced Migration*. A Sociological, Literary, and Theological Approach on the Displacement and Resettlement of the Southern Kingdom of Judah (BZAW 417; Berlin 2011) 1-35.

III. When the Complaint Was Made

Having determined the situation which Habakkuk was complaining about in 1,14, there remains the matter of when he made the complaint. Regarding this, there are two possibilities.

First, the most natural way to read the *wayyiqtol* verb which begins the complaint (וַיַּעַשׂ [“you have made”]) is as a reference to a past event ¹¹. Such a reading of the verb would mean that the complaint in 1,14 was first written/spoken after the cataclysm of 586, and that Habakkuk was complaining about what had happened in 586 from the vantage point of the situation which had ensued thereafter ¹².

If 1,14 was first written/spoken after 586, it is reasonable to assume that the related imagery in 1,15-17 and the whole of Habakkuk’s speech in 1,12-17 were as well. Assuming this, and focusing on the imagery-complex of 1,14-17, the imagery in 1,15a alludes to deportation, which is part of the event-complex of 586. The *yiqtol* verbs found in 1,15a would, therefore, be “pulled into their archaic past-time reference by discourse cohesion” with the *wayyiqtol* past-time verb in 1,14 ¹³. The time frame of the *yiqtol*-verb celebrations in 1,15b-16 would probably also be past time, though it could be present-time if the celebrations were ongoing. And the interrogative + *yiqtol*-verb combination in 1,17 was a question about the future. Thus, 1,14-17 would have the following time structure:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| 1,14 | you have made the people leaderless |
| 1,15a | the foe brought the people up with a hook [...] |
| 1,15b-16 | because of this, the foe rejoiced [...] [or] because of this, the foe rejoices [...] |
| 1,17 | how long will the foe destroy nations? |

With this post-586 time structure in mind, the coming of the Babylonians is described as astonishing in Hab 1,5-6, which means that God’s

¹¹ ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 173-174.

¹² The terms *מִצְדָּה* and *מִצְדָּר* are used by Habakkuk in 2,1 to describe where he will wait to hear God’s response to his complaint. *מִצְדָּה* has been understood as a watchtower, guardpost, or lookout, and *מִצְדָּר* as a tower, guardpost, wall, rampart, siege tower, or stronghold. If these terms refer to an actual location/structure in or around Jerusalem, and if Hab 1,14 (and therefore Hab 2,1) was first written/spoken after 586, then the mention of this location/structure in 2,1 might be ironic if the location/structure had been destroyed by the Babylonians. The terms could, however, refer to an intact location/structure, or the language in 2,1 could be “[...] metaphoric for prophetic waiting for an oracle” (ROBERTS, *Nahum*, 108).

¹³ ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 174.

announcement in 1,5-11 was first written/spoken at a time before the Babylonians had made their presence directly felt in Judah, and so, probably before their appearance in Philistine territory in 604¹⁴. If 1,12-17 was first written/spoken after 586, then God's announcement in 1,5-11 and Habakkuk's complaint in 1,12-17 were separated by many years (ca. pre-604 for 1,5-11 and ca. post-586 for 1,12-17). This would mean that Habakkuk had a long prophetic career, and was conscious of and was keeping track of the long trajectory of history and divine action.

Second, although the most natural way to read the *wayyiqtol* verb in 1,14 is as a reference to an actual past event, it is possible that the verb reflects the thinking of a prophet who has, "in his mind...projected himself into a future point of view from which what is to come can be described as having occurred"¹⁵. Such a reading of the verb would mean that the complaint in 1,14, and presumably the whole of Habakkuk's speech in 1,12-17, was first written/spoken prior to the cataclysm of 586, and that Habakkuk was complaining about what he believed the Babylonians would eventually do to Judah — that is, that they would eventually bring the Davidic polity to an end.

Several things could have led him to such a belief: 1) the ferocity of the language in God's announcement of the Babylonian assault (1,5-11); 2) the destruction of the nearby city-state of Ashkelon and its royal polity by the Babylonians in 604; 3) the statements of his contemporary Jeremiah announcing the demise of the Davidic monarchy, Jerusalem, and several of the last Davidic kings and their lineages, all at the hands of the Babylonians (e.g., Jer 21,1-10; 22,24-30; 32,1-5.26-35; 34,1-22; 36,27-32; 37,3-10; 38,1-23); 4) the manipulation of the Davidic monarchy by the Babylonians in 597, when they deported Jehoiachin and installed Zedekiah as king (2 Kgs 24,8-17; 2 Chr 36,9-10).

In the case of a pre-586 setting for 1,14, the time structure of 1,14-17 would be the same as that described above for a post-586 setting. The verbal time frames, however, would all be embedded within the visionary or imagined future.

The issue of whether Hab 1,14 (and all of 1,12-17) was first written/spoken before or after 586 will not be settled here. To do so would require a thorough analysis of the relationship between 1,14-17 and the rest of 1,12-17, the relationship between 1,12-17 and the other sections of the book, the dates of the other sections of the book, and various other

¹⁴ ROBERTS, *Nahum*, 95; FLOYD, *Minor Prophets*, 84, 87; ANDERSEN, *Habakkuk*, 168; ROBERTSON, *The Books*, 36-37; BAILEY, "Habakkuk", 260, 301.

¹⁵ J. JOOSTEN, *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose* (JBS 10; Jerusalem 2012) 423. See also G. HATAV, "Past and Future Interpretation of Wayyiqtol", *JSS* 61 (2011) 105-107.

matters. These are all complex issues and well beyond the scope of this brief study. What will be said is this. Given the more natural reading of the *wayyiqtol* verb in 1,14 as a reference to an actual past event, and the lack of any indication in 1,14 or 1,12-17 that Habakkuk was having a vision of the future or simply imagining it, a post-586 date for 1,14 seems more likely than a pre-586 date. And given the anguished and vivid description of the deportation and celebrations in 1,15-17, it seems likely that 1,14 was first written/spoken soon after 586 when the cataclysm was still fresh in Habakkuk's mind.

Calvin College
Grand Rapids, MI 49546
U.S.A.

Richard WHITEKETTLE

SUMMARY

In Hab 1,14, Habakkuk complained that God had made the human targets of Babylonian aggression to be like leaderless aquatic animals. Aquatic animals are leaderless, not because they have a leader who is absent or inept, but because they simply have no leaders. Habakkuk was complaining then that God had made the targets of Babylonian aggression to have no governance system of their own. He was complaining, therefore, about the cataclysm of 586 BCE, when the native political system in Judah — the Davidic monarchy and its administrative apparatus — ceased to exist and the people of Judah were absorbed into the Babylonian Empire.

Requesting and Rejecting: Παραιτέομαι in Heb 12,18-29

In Heb 12,18-29, the author contrasts Israel's experience at Sinai with that of his readers at "Mount Zion and the city of the living God — the heavenly Jerusalem" (12,22). This contrast concerns not only their respective locations but their responses as well: Israel is criticized for "refusing" (παραιτέομαι; 12,19.25) to heed the word of God spoken to them at the mountain, and the audience of Hebrews is warned not to follow suit (12,25). Most scholars have taken this as a clear critique of Israel's fearful withdrawal at Mt. Sinai, though debate continues as to how that critique relates to the seemingly positive evaluation of Israel's fear in the Pentateuchal accounts (Exod 20,18-21; Deut 5,23-29) ¹.

A minority report suggests that this standard reading of Heb 12,18-29 is mistaken. The author, some conclude, uses παραιτέομαι in 12,19 simply to describe Israel's "request" at Sinai, whereas in 12,25 he uses παραιτέομαι to denounce not their fearful request for a mediator at Sinai but their subsequent rebellions in the wilderness between Sinai and Kadesh Barnea. Thus Heb 12,18-21 refers (neutrally) to the Sinai theophany, but Heb 12,25 refers (critically) to post-Sinai events.

The basis for this interpretation is the claim that παραιτέομαι takes on a positive nuance ("to request") when followed by μή and an infinitive, but a negative meaning ("to reject" or "to refuse") when followed by an accusative direct object ². So in Hebrews 12 we have the following:

¹ E. GRÄSSER, *An die Hebräer* (EKKNT 17; Zürich 1990-1997) III, 307; H.W. ATTRIDGE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews. A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia, PA 1989) 373; C.R. KOESTER, *Hebrews. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 36; New York 2001) 543; F. LAUB, *Hebräerbrief* (SKKNT 14; Stuttgart 1988) 175; H. HEGERMANN, *Die Brief an die Hebräer* (THKNT 16; Berlin 1988) 257; L.T. JOHNSON, *Hebrews* (NTL; Louisville, KY 2006) 334. C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux* (EBib; Paris 1952) II, 404; G.W. BUCHANAN, *To the Hebrews* (AB; Garden City, NY 1972) 224; P.E. HUGHES, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, MI 1977) 556; H-F. WEISS, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK 13; Göttingen 1991) 672; O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (KEK 12; Göttingen 1966) 462.

² The distinction first appeared, as far as I can tell, in J.H. THAYER, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York 1886) 482. Thayer mistakenly cites the lexicons of G.B. WINER (1872) and A. BUTTMAN (1873), both of whom merely note that the μή in Heb 12,19 is pleonastic (which actually works against Thayer's position) and make no distinction between παραιτέομαι in Heb 12,19 and 12,25. The distinction is not found in Preuschen's original *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften*

οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρητήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον
 “Those who heard requested that no further word be spoken to them”
 (12,19)

Βλέπετε μὴ παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα· εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι
ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα
 “See that you do not refuse the one who speaks; for if those who re-
 fused the one who warned from earth did not escape” (12,25)

This proposed syntactical distinction (παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive vs. παραιτέομαι + accusative direct object) does not, unfortunately, match the use of this word in either koine or classical Greek literature. First, the claim that παραιτέομαι has two nuances (“to reject” and “to request”) vastly understates the range of meanings of this word. It can also mean “to implore” (Esth 4,8) ³, “to intercede” (e.g., *Test. Levi* 5.6-7) ⁴, “to excuse oneself” (Luke 14,18-19), “to escape” (Acts 25,11), “to dismiss” (Josephus, *Ant.* 7.167), “to ask forgiveness” (3 *Macc* 6.27), or “to avoid” (Philo, *De Vita Moses* 1.83).

Second, while παραιτέομαι does frequently indicate the “rejection” of its accusative direct object (4 *Macc* 11.2; 1 Tim 4,7; Heb 12,25; Josephus, *Ant.* 16.243; *Diog.* 6.10; Philo, *Det.* 19; *Leg.* 3.144;) we find plenty of examples of παραιτέομαι, such as those listed below, whose accusative direct object is “requested” or “interceded for” rather than “rejected”.

“Now during the feast [Pilate] would release to them one prisoner — whomever they requested [ὃν παρητοῦντο]” (Mk 15,6).

Mordecai instructed Esther “not to consider it beneath her dignity to put on humble attire in which to intercede for the Jews [παραιτήσεται τοὺς Ἰουδαίους] who were in danger” (Josephus, *Ant.* 11.225).

des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (Gießen 1910) 863, but does appear in Bauer’s first (1928) edition and in all subsequent German and English editions. The prominence of the distinction in exegetical scholarship is primarily due to J.M. CASEY, “Eschatology in Heb 12:14-29: An Exegetical Study” (S.T.D. Diss., Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven 1976) 324-325. Casey’s argument is taken up by W.L. LANE, *Hebrews 9–13* (WBC 47B; Dallas, TX 1991) 462-463; P.T. O’BRIEN, *The Letter to the Hebrews* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI 2010) 480 n. 186; cf. D.M. ALLEN, *Deuteronomy and Exhortation in Hebrews. A Study in Narrative Re-Presentation* (WUNT II/238; Tübingen 2008) 91 n. 277.

³ In this case the person being implored, rather than the content of the request, is in the accusative case (εἰσελθούση παραιτήσασθαι τὸν βασιλεία).

⁴ Here, those on whose behalf intercession is taking place take the accusative case (τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ).

“He delivered to the woman the one [τόν] for whose life she had asked [παραιτέετο]” (Herodotus 3.119).

“I am the angel who intercedes for [ὁ παραιτούμενος] the race of Israel [τὸ γένος Ἰσραήλ]” (*Test. Levi* 5.6).

Third, the lone text marshaled as evidence of παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive alongside Heb 12.19, Thucydides 5.63.3, is really no parallel at all.

ὁ δὲ παρητεῖτο μηδὲν τούτων δρᾶν

“But he besought them to do none of these things.”

παραιτέομαι + infinitive (δρᾶν) + accusative direct object of the infinitive (μηδέν)⁵

Note the difference between that text and Heb 12.19:

οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρητήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον

“Those who heard requested that no further word be spoken to them”.

παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive (προστεθῆναι) + accusative subject of the infinitive (λόγον)

We do possess at least two close parallels to the syntax of Heb 12.19.

Plato, *Rep.* 3.387b:

παραιτησόμεθα Ὅμηρόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητὰς μὴ χαλεπαίνειν

“We shall plead with Homer and the rest of the poets not to be angry”.

παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive (χαλεπαίνειν) + accusative subject of the infinitive (Ὅμηρόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς)

Josephus, *Ant.* 10.203:

Δανιήλος παρητεῖτο πρῶτον μὴ σοφώτερον αὐτὸν δόξαι τῶν ἄλλων

“Daniel first begged that he might not be thought wiser than the others”.

παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive (δόξαι) + accusative subject of the infinitive (αὐτόν)

The first of these is most naturally understood as “to request” or some similar term. To say “We shall reject the anger of Homer and the rest of the poets” would clearly be taking Plato’s words in an entirely different direction than that indicated by their context. The second, however, could go either way — and this illustrates the problem: to say “Daniel begged

⁵ THUCYDIDES, *History of the Peloponnesian War* 5.63.3. For a similar construction see JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* 5.14.

that he might not be thought wiser than the others” is not so very different from saying “Daniel refused to be thought wiser than the others”. For two reasons, then, these texts do not prove that παραιτέομαι + μή + infinitive necessarily implies a positive nuance (“request”) rather than a negative one (“refuse”). First, syntactical parallels between Hebrews and one early 4th century BCE document and one late 1st century CE document, neither of which has any connection to Hebrews apart from this single syntactical construction, are an insufficient basis upon which to build such an argument. Second, one of these parallels (*Ant.* 10.203) illustrates the fact that in some contexts the lines between the “negative” and “positive” nuances of παραιτέομαι are blurred at best.

The claim that Heb 12,19 and 12,25 refer to different events in Israel’s history is thus unsustainable on syntactical grounds, as shown above, and no less so on contextual grounds. The evidence is overwhelming, in fact, that Heb 12,25-29 continues to have its sights set on Sinai.

First, the contrast in Heb 12,18-29 between heaven and earth, or what is heavenly and what is earthly, begins with the contrast between the “palpability” of Sinai (12,18) and the heavenly locale of Zion (12,22), continues through the contrast between the warning that took place “on earth” and the one that happened “from heaven” (12,25), and climaxes with the claim that both earth and heaven will one day be shaken (12,26). The heaven/earth theme, established by the comparison of Sinai with Zion, continues throughout the pericope.

Second, the most natural referent of ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα ἐπὶ γῆς (those who did not escape when they rejected the one who warned on earth) in 12,25 is the same group of people just identified in 12,18-20, that is, the Israelites who stood at Sinai.

Third, in Heb 12,26-27, the author uses Hag 2,6 to point toward the earth being shaken ἔτι ἅπαξ — “once more” or “one more time”. And this poses the question: if the eschatological shaking of all creation will be once more, then when did the previous shaking — specifically the shaking of the earth — take place? What possible answer is there other than the Sinai theophany?

Finally, Heb 12,18-29 closes with a citation of Deut 4,24 (ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκων; “our God is [a] consuming fire”) ⁶, suggesting that the preceding exhortation (Heb 12,25-28) is ultimately based on the character of the God who spoke from the fire at Sinai — making it certain that from start to finish the author of Hebrews has the Sinai events in view.

* *

*

⁶ See, e.g., LANE, *Hebrews* 9–13, 500; GRÄSSER, *Hebräer*, 3.338; WEISS, *Hebräer*, 695.

In conclusion, then, neither syntactical nor contextual considerations support the argument that two different evaluations of two different moments are in view in Heb 12,19 and 12,25. The repeated use of *παραιτέομαι*, alongside the other factors just discussed, demonstrates that the author of Hebrews views Israel's fearful withdrawal from the Sinai theophany as a rejection of God that must not be imitated by those who hear him speak from Zion.

Wheaton College
Department of Biblical and Theological Studies
500 College Ave.
Wheaton, IL 60188
U.S.A.

Michael KIBBE

SUMMARY

This short note examines the three occurrences of *παραιτέομαι* in Heb 12,18-29 and suggests that the repeated use of the word demonstrates the author's evaluation of Israel's "request" for distance from God at Sinai as a rejection of his word to them. While some have distinguished the meaning (and referent) of *παραιτέομαι* in 12,19 from that in 12,25, this distinction is unsustainable in light of the use of *παραιτέομαι* outside of Hebrews and of the flow of thought in Heb 12,18-29.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Enzo APPELLA, *Autorità contestata e confermata*. Ambizione umana e progetto divino nella storia di Core, Datan e Abiram (Nm 16) (Aloisiana, nuova serie 1). Trapani, Il Pozzo di Giacobbe, 2013. 364 p. 17 × 24. €28,50.

Lo studio di Enzo Appella si confronta con il capitolo 16 del libro dei Numeri, uno dei passaggi più complessi dell'intero Pentateuco per le molteplici implicazioni connesse con la sua forma finale. L'analisi viene portata avanti sia dal punto di vista sincronico che diacronico, al fine di analizzare il significato del testo nella sua forma attuale e, al contempo, di ricostruirne il processo redazionale. La ricerca intende dimostrare che il testo riflette una narrativa che, nonostante le tracce superficiali di incoerenza, è unitaria, nonostante la visione tradizionale interpreti il racconto come una bizzarra fusione di differenti tradizioni. Dal punto di vista narrativo, il testo di Numeri 16 presenta, secondo l'A., la ribellione di Core, Datan e Abiram come un tentativo di mettere in discussione l'autorità di Mosè e di Aronne, sfociato in una dura punizione da parte di YHWH che rivendica a se stesso l'origine dell'autorità di costoro.

L'esposizione si articola in otto capitoli. Il primo considera le tensioni presenti nel testo: la molteplicità di trame, le ambiguità che circondano la morte di Core, le ripetizioni presenti nei dialoghi di Mosè e i mutamenti spaziali sono, a detta di Appella, i principali problemi posti da Numeri 16. La disamina di tali problemi è seguita da uno *status quaestionis*, nel quale vengono riportati vari tentativi di spiegazione delle incongruenze. Setacciando le proposte provenienti tanto dalla critica letteraria come dalla storia delle tradizioni, l'A. conclude che Numeri 16 sia frutto dell'armonizzazione tra tradizioni sacerdotali e non-sacerdotali, collocate nel contesto dei "racconti di mormorazione" disseminati in Esodo-Numeri.

Nel secondo capitolo, dedicato allo studio delle componenti intradiegetiche della narrazione, l'A. affronta le difficoltà testuali emerse e sostiene che Numeri 16 rappresenta un'unità letteraria separata, con un chiaro inizio e una fine altrettanto marcata, frutto di una grande abilità letteraria. Giovandosi degli strumenti dell'analisi narrativa, Appella sostiene che il testo di Numeri 16 presenta una trama che è, al contempo, di risoluzione e riconoscimento, articolata in 9 scene. Inoltre, tiene per valida l'ipotesi in base a cui la trama progredisca in maniera lineare attraverso i passaggi dello schema quinario canonico (106).

I capitoli III-V sono dedicati alla presentazione dei personaggi. Dopo una nota sul ruolo dei personaggi nella narrativa biblica in genere e in Numeri 16 in specie, nel terzo capitolo l'autore introduce l'antagonista della storia, Core, la cui presentazione è caratterizzata da una discussione sulla sua identità in cui si sottolinea l'ascendenza levitica. L'A. insiste sull'agire del personaggio quale si evince dalla narrazione, sostenendo che si tratti di una chiara espressione della sua brama del sacerdozio.

Il quarto capitolo presenta i complici di Core, che emergono sulla ribalta man mano che la trama del racconto va dipanandosi: sono Datan e Abiram, definiti "secondi personaggi" (118). L'A. osserva che, laddove il ruolo di Core consiste nell'agire, Datan e Abiram emergono per il parlare: essi fanno riferimento alle parole del Signore per giustificare la propria ribellione contro Mosè (e Aronne). Facendo ciò essi distorcono le parole divine, da essi citate astutamente evitando alcuni elementi essenziali: nel v. 3 evitano il riferimento all'origine divina della mediazione sacerdotale e nei vv. 12-14 non fanno alcun riferimento a Dio. Una simile presentazione dei personaggi e del loro modo di agire inviterebbe il lettore a prendere atto della falsità dei ribelli e, per contrasto, della credibilità del narratore, alla luce delle informazioni provviste da altri testi pertinenti.

La presentazione dei personaggi viene completata dall'introduzione del protagonista della storia, ovvero Mosè, che viene descritto sulla base delle sue azioni e delle sue parole, condensate in tre discorsi. Considerando il fatto che il tempo raccontato (*erzählte Zeit*) e il tempo raccontante (*Erzählzeit*) sembrano quasi coincidere nella gran parte del racconto di Numeri 16 e traendo spunto dall'organizzazione delle dodici tribù intorno alla tenda del convegno (cf. Nm 3,14-39), l'A. arguisce che "tempo" e "spazio" nel racconto di Numeri 16 aggiungano enfasi al protagonista della vicenda e alla sua vittoria finale. In breve, in questo capitolo viene richiamata l'attenzione sul fatto che Numeri 16 rappresenta una narrazione unificata, che si dipana intorno al vero e grande protagonista della vicenda: Mosè.

Nel sesto capitolo si esamina l'influenza che Numeri 16 ebbe sulle tradizioni susseguenti: non stupisce che Core, Datan e Abiram vengano rappresentati come prototipi dei ribelli nelle tradizioni successive. L'A. segnala come la LXX insista sulla posizione singolare di Mosè e presenti Core in una cattiva luce; echi della ribellione di Core, Datan e Abiram si possono rintracciare nella letteratura rabbinica, negli scritti di Filone, di Giuseppe Flavio, dello Pseudo Filone, nella letteratura cristiana antica e persino nel Corano.

L'A. passa ad affrontare il testo da una diversa prospettiva nel capitolo settimo, dedicato a un'analisi di tipo diacronico. Su questo versante, Appella sostiene — sostanzialmente in linea con l'opinione comune — che Numeri 16 sia il risultato di un complesso processo redazionale, comprendente tre strati di materiale letterario riconducibile a due tipologie,

che egli così definisce: non sacerdotale e sacerdotale. Il primo strato sarebbe rappresentato dalla tradizione non sacerdotale facente capo a Datan e Abiram, che rifletterebbe una ribellione contro l'autorità sviluppata nel periodo della "riforma di Giosia". Dietro la protesta contro l'autorità mosaica così com'è presentata in Numeri 16, postula l'A., ci sarebbe nascosto il rifiuto del potere esercitato sulla nazione da Giosia. Questo primo strato letterario del racconto sarebbe andato soggetto a due interventi redazionali di stampo sacerdotale, volti ad amalgamare il racconto dei duecentocinquanta uomini che reclamavano diritti culturali e quello di Core e i leviti che, dal loro canto, reclamavano prerogative tipiche del sacerdozio. Appella arguisce che Core e i leviti siano "figure post-redazionali" (245) inserite nella storia dall'ultimo redattore in un contesto genericamente definito post-esilico allo scopo di acclarare la situazione relativa alla gerarchia sacerdotale che esisteva in quel periodo, marcata da una netta divisione tra il sacerdozio aronitico e i leviti. Core e i leviti rappresenterebbero il "clero minore" che, escluso dal sacerdozio, protesta contro la restrizione dell'esercizio sacerdotale alla sola discendenza di Aronne: la narrativa di Numeri 16 nella sua forma attuale contesterebbe tale pretesa, condannandola come una ribellione contro uno stato di cose che risulta divinamente istituito. Il capitolo si conclude con la riproposizione sintetica delle tappe della ricerca e la produzione della traduzione del testo.

L'ultimo capitolo affronta la prospettiva teologica del racconto. L'argomentazione è innescata dal richiamo all'uso prolifico del termine עֵדָה (congregazione/assemblea). Il fatto che questo termine sia usato per lo più in senso negativo per indicare il gruppo convocato da Core in Numeri 16 rappresenterebbe un indizio del fatto che la vera assemblea del Signore è quella capeggiata da Mosè e Aronne in virtù del mandato divino. Appella rinviene in questo racconto un tentativo di prevenire la comunità post-esilica da possibili sfide all'autorità costituita in base alla visione sacerdotale. Infine, secondo l'A., questo racconto conterrebbe un rimando alla conclusione del ciclo di Giacobbe, la cui maledizione a Ruben e Levi (cf. Gn 49,3-7) troverebbe compimento nei rispettivi discendenti, i rubeniti Datan e Abiram e il levita Core con tutta la sua gente.

Dopo averne riassunto il contenuto, passiamo a una valutazione globale dell'opera di Appella. Fin dalle prime pagine, l'A. si è detto consapevole di cimentarsi con uno dei testi più complessi della Torah: oltretutto il coraggio di una simile impresa, gli va riconosciuto il merito di aver affrontato i diversi problemi concernenti tale testo con chiarezza, dovizia d'informazioni e rispettoso riferimento all'opera di chi prima di lui si era cimentato nell'analisi di Numeri 16. Al netto di alcuni refusi, il testo si presenta in forma scorrevole e il lettore si trova piacevolmente accompagnato nella disamina delle molteplici questioni da un periodare piano e chiaro. L'articolazione interna dei singoli capitoli e gli opportuni paragrafi

di sintesi che giungono a conclusione dei passaggi salienti dell'argomentazione, unitamente agli indici degli autori e delle citazioni bibliche, costituiscono un elemento di ricchezza che facilita la fruibilità del testo. La bibliografia, organizzata tematicamente, è ben nutrita e generalmente aggiornata.

Entrando maggiormente nella valutazione dei contenuti, risulta apprezzabile lo sforzo compiuto dall'A. nel far dialogare sincronia e diacronia, assestando i metodi alla comprensione del testo e non viceversa: cosa tutt'altro che scontata, persino ai giorni nostri. Dopo un ampio e documentato *status quaestionis* di cui abbiamo reso conto, il testo biblico viene sottoposto al vaglio dell'analisi narrativa: l'acquisizione più rilevante da questo punto di vista ci pare la sottolineatura della sostanziale coerenza letteraria di un testo che solo a uno sguardo superficiale si presenta come un guazzabuglio di tematiche mischiate alla rinfusa nella forma finale. Meno convincente, invece, risulta la sensazione di *reductio ad unum* che qua e là il lettore avverte, riconducibile forse alla necessità avvertita dall'A. di bilanciare l'opinione tradizionale, che liquida Numeri 16 come racconto disomogeneo. Riteniamo che, nonostante gli elementi di coerenza ampiamente segnalati dallo studio di Appella, non si possa sottacere la pluralità di voci e interessi che s'incrociano dietro le righe del testo, tra le quali tralucono i segni del lavoro redazionale, per accurato che possa essere stato. Anche l'analisi diacronica sviluppata dall'A. suscita alcuni interrogativi: lo sforzo di collocare la problematica testuale nell'ampio dibattito relativo alla composizione del Pentateuco è certamente lodevole, ma si sottopone al rischio della deriva ideologica che accompagna tutte le generalizzazioni. Ad esempio, l'individuazione nella Giuda del re Giosia di un ambiente adatto a spiegare la natura e la finalità della tradizione rubenita di Datan e Abiram (231-232) non pare tenere nel giusto conto il peso delle questioni connesse alla cosiddetta "riforma giosianica", specie sul versante della sua plausibilità storica. Il tentativo di datazione dei testi è sempre arduo e nasconde delle insidie: una di queste consiste nel non tenere nel giusto conto la distinzione tra le tradizioni e la loro fissazione letteraria. Risalire all'antichità di una tradizione è impresa titanica, se non addirittura impossibile; ragionare sulla sua fissazione letteraria non è molto più semplice, ma consente di giungere a risultati più accettabili. Forse la distinzione tra questi due livelli (tradizione e fissazione letteraria della stessa) non è sempre cristallina nel testo che abbiamo davanti: la qual cosa non inficia il giudizio globalmente positivo che merita la ricerca di Appella, che va salutata come un importante tentativo di riflessione su un tema — quello dell'autorità — che continua a suscitare interesse.

Keith BODNER, *Elisha's Profile in the Book of Kings*. The Double Agent. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013. x-180 p. 14,5 × 22,5. £55.00

Col presente studio l'autore dà un saggio interessante di *narrative criticism* prendendo come oggetto d'analisi la storia del profeta Eliseo così come si dipana in 2 Re 2–13. Bodner intende superare l'approccio corrente storico-critico che legge i vari brani o racconti su Eliseo come una catena di frammenti ascrivibili a svariate fonti, preferendo invece leggerli come le parti organicamente interconnesse di un racconto omogeneo avente per protagonista il profeta. A sua volta, tale racconto si connette intrinsecamente con quello riguardante il profeta Elia, predecessore e mentore eccellente di Eliseo (1 Re 19,15-21; 2 Re 2). Il legame, poi, tra i due profeti ha una stretta relazione nel quadro della storia deuteronomistica, all'interno della quale la missione dei due personaggi è quella giudiziale di accompagnare il destino della casa degli Omridi verso la sua estinzione. Come si può osservare, quindi, la lettura critico-narrativa del Bodner si muove seguendo questa triplice stratificazione: a) Elia-Eliseo; b) Eliseo; c) storia deuteronomistica (13). Egli usa un'etichetta per indicare la funzione narrativa di Eliseo lungo questo intreccio, quello di "doppio agente", in riferimento alla richiesta da lui fatta ad Elia di ricevere in eredità la porzione spettante secondo Dt 21,17 al primogenito, cioè la porzione doppia in questo caso del suo spirito (2 Re 2,9). In base a questa richiesta, che il Bodner interpreta narrativamente, Eliseo avrebbe ricevuto il compito funzionale di non limitarsi ad essere simile al suo mentore, bensì a doppiarne la missione; in altri termini, egli non avrebbe semplicemente continuato quanto già fatto da Elia (oltre alla missione ininterrotta contro la casa di Omri, l'episodio della provvisione alla sussistenza di una povera donna e della sua famiglia: 1 Re 17,8-16 e 2 Re 4,1-7 e quello della resurrezione di un bambino: 1 Re 17,17-24 e 2 Re 4,20-37), ma lo avrebbe in certo qual modo duplicato con il portarlo alla conclusione (cf. 162).

Posta la premessa metodologica e inquadrato il progetto del suo lavoro, l'autore dispiega la sua analisi narrativa in sei capitoli più un post-scriptum sintetico finale, dando a ciascuno un titolo dedotto dalla selezione dei testi presi in esame.

Nel primo capitolo, "L'apprendista", Bodner prende in visione soprattutto la missione previa di Elia, dopo la teofania sull'Oreb, consistente nella triplice unzione di tre sommovitori d'ordine: Cazel, Iehu ed Eliseo (1 Re 19,15-21). Questo capitolo è necessario alla funzionalità del metodo narrativo, in quanto pone le basi di quella triplice stratificazione lungo la quale andrà condotta l'analisi relativa alla carriera di Eliseo. Il secondo capitolo, "Successioni incendiarie", analizza soprattutto 2 Re 2, cioè l'episodio della consacrazione di Eliseo a successore di Elia e il rapimento in cielo di costui in un turbine di fuoco. Nel capitolo terzo, "Musica e maternità", abbiamo la lettura narrativa di 2 Re 3–4, che contengono, tra altri

elementi, anche il racconto delle modalità di espletamento dell'incarico profetico tramite la musica e l'episodio della provvisione dell'olio alla moglie di uno dei "figli dei profeti". Il quarto capitolo, "Asce e alleati", si occupa di quattro episodi presenti in 2 Re 4,38-41 (risanamento della minestra), in 2 Re 4,42-44 (moltiplicazione del cibo), in 2 Re 5 (Naaman) e in 2 Re 6,1-8 (l'ascia galleggiante).

Il quinto capitolo, il cui titolo potremmo tradurlo con "Comprensione in contrasto", affronta una serie di testi complessi, nei quali più che mai i tre livelli di lettura si interpenetrano. In 2 Re 6,8-23 il re di Aram cerca di venire a capo di come Israele riesca a prevenire i suoi piani, sospettando addirittura una spia all'interno dei suoi. Quando viene a sapere del dono della preveggenza di Eliseo, egli si mette in marcia per neutralizzarlo, ma al suo arrivo a Dotan, lui e il suo esercito vengono accecati e condotti addirittura a Samaria, dove il re d'Israele potrebbe fare vittoriosamente tutti prigionieri o addirittura ammazzarli, ma glielo proibisce Eliseo: non è del re d'Israele la vittoria, ma dello spirito di profezia che Eliseo ha ricevuto da Dio. Nell'altro episodio di 6,24-7,2, inspiegabilmente ad una prima lettura dopo l'episodio precedente, si ha un assedio feroce di Samaria da parte degli aramei, tanto da provocare una tremenda carestia, della quale il re Ioram incolpa Eliseo (6,31); Eliseo invece emette un oracolo salvifico, irriso da un eunuco del re, al quale però Eliseo predice una brutta fine. In quel frangente, quattro lebbrosi, per non morire di fame, si fanno coraggio e vanno nell'accampamento arameo, che trovano vuoto di uomini, ma pieno di ricchezze. Al loro ritorno, ne informano gli israeliti, i quali, forti della fuga dei nemici, si lanciano alla conquista dei beni abbandonati. Nella foga, il sopradetto eunuco viene schiacciato dalla folla. La parola di Eliseo viene confermata. Ancora una volta, non è il re omride a dare salvezza, ma solo Dio per il tramite di Eliseo.

L'ultimo capitolo non è meno complesso del precedente. Il titolo di "Salite al trono", inteso come l'avvicinarsi cruento di re, si occupa della fine di Ben Hadad di Damasco ad opera del regicida Cazaël e della tragica fine della dinastia omride perpetrata da Iehu. I testi selezionati si trovano tra il cap. 8 e il cap. 13 di 2 Re, cioè là dove la carriera di Eliseo volge al termine, ma in modo ancora clamoroso. Difatti, mentre il progetto giudiziale contro gli omridi si conclude con il bagno di sangue perpetrato da Iehu, fatto ungere re da un assistente del profeta, Eliseo, prossimo alla morte, decreta la labilità anche dei successori di Iehu, che non hanno desistito dalla sfiducia nella parola del profeta. Tale conclusione s'inquadra nella più ampia teologia deuteronomistica.

Il Post-scriptum, infine, prende occasione dall'episodio della reviviscenza di un cadavere seppellito nella tomba di Eliseo, per rilevare che siamo di fronte ad un messaggio che spiegherebbe che l'influsso profetico a beneficio del popolo d'Israele potrà continuare anche dopo la morte del personaggio storico: basterà mantenersi fedeli agli insegnamenti di Dio. Il resto del capitolo è una breve sintesi del lavoro fatto.

La rapida elencazione dei contenuti del libro di Bodner non rende giustizia all'accurata e intelligente analisi dei testi sopra elencati. Lo stile dell'autore è brillante e invita il lettore a coinvolgersi nel processo dinamico della narrazione che egli sa investigare con acume. A tutta prima potrebbe sembrare che egli faccia una lettura continua dei testi solo un po' più sviluppata di una operazione "targumica"; in realtà, Bodner sa scovare legami filologici e semantici che diano continuità e senso al tessuto narrativo. Ad esempio, l'episodio delle due orse che divorano i quarantadue ragazzi di Betel che avevano insultato Eliseo (2 Re 2,23-24), che correntemente viene letto come un episodio strano nell'accumulo dei fatti prodigiosi riguardanti il profeta, trova in Bodner tutta una serie di collegamenti e spiegazioni che servono a dare senso a un episodio che pare non averne. I quarantadue ragazzi preannuncerebbero metaforicamente la strage dei quarantadue familiari del re Acazia ad opera di Iehu (2 Re 10,14); del resto, non bisogna dimenticare che Betel era la città "idolatra" dello scisma di Geroboamo. Innumerevoli sono i collegamenti di senso che l'autore sa far venire fuori da una lettura funzionale del racconto biblico da 1 Re 17 a 2 Re 13 e sono tutti da godere.

Naturalmente, non sono poche le volte, proprio a causa della natura del metodo adoperato, nelle quali il lettore rimane perplesso. Nonostante il rinvenimento forzoso di una logica nella sequenza dell'assedio a Samaria subito dopo il racconto della vittoria sugli aramei (cf. sopra al cap. 5), non si può nascondere il carattere compilatorio degli episodi della missione di Eliseo. Inoltre, l'autore non dà una soddisfacente spiegazione di tipo critico-narrativo al perché le triplici unzioni comandate da Dio ad Elia in 1 Re 19,15-17 vengano operate da Eliseo e neanche in modo coerente: Eliseo non consacra Cazaël né unge Iehu personalmente (cf. 142). In breve, alcune volte Bodner ci mette di fronte a delle soluzioni interpretative che non possono essere né accettate né rifiutate. Ma forse proprio in questo aspetto consiste l'originalità della sua lettura del testo biblico, il quale col suo metodo viene reso vivo e intrigante: una finalità che non possiamo che condividere.

Pontificia Università *Antoniana*
Via Merulana 124
I-00185 Roma

Marco NOBILE

Roger Marcel WANKE, *Darstellungen von der Gegenwart Gottes im Hiobbuch* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 421). Berlin – New York, Walter de Gruyter, 2013. xii - 480 p. 16 × 23,5. € 159,95

R.M. Wanke hat sich zur Aufgabe gemacht, dem Gottesbild im Hiobbuch nachzugehen. Konkret beschäftigt er sich mit der Frage nach der Gegenwart Gottes, die theologisch im Buch Hiob gleichzeitig auch seine Verborgenheit einschließe.

Die Untersuchung gliedert sich in vier Kapitel. Nach einer sehr umfangreichen Einführung in die Thematik und Fragestellung (1-78) folgt in einem zweiten Kapitel der exegetische Hauptteil der Arbeit: die Untersuchung einer ersten Redaktionsschicht (79-377). Das dritte Kapitel stellt die Analyse einer weiteren Redaktionsschicht vor (379-410). Das Schlusskapitel fasst die Ergebnisse der redaktionsgeschichtlichen Untersuchungen hinsichtlich der thematischen Frage nach der Gegenwart Gottes im Hiobbuch zusammen (411-430).

R.M. Wanke geht von einem längeren Entstehungsprozess des Hiobbuches aus. Methodisch verfolgt er in seiner Arbeit einen stark redaktionsgeschichtlich orientierten Ansatz, bezieht aber auch literarkritische, form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Methoden ein. Der Schwerpunkt liegt also auf einer diachronen Untersuchung (74).

R.M. Wanke geht davon aus, dass es ursprünglich eine selbstständige Hiobberzählung sowie -dichtung gegeben hat. Ein Redaktor habe beides miteinander verknüpft (3) und dabei sowohl den Erzähltext als auch die Dichtung erweitert und überarbeitet. Auf das Konto einer Redaktion seien beispielsweise die beiden Himmelsszenen innerhalb der Rahmenerzählung zurückzuführen. Ausgehend von der Annahme mehrerer Bearbeitungen, stellt R.M. Wanke die Frage nach dem "inhaltlichen Leitfaden" (= *redaktionale Kompatibilität*) des Buches. Als einen solchen erkennt er das Thema der Gegenwart Gottes (24).

Die Frage nach der Gegenwart Gottes im Hiobbuch ist nicht ganz neu; bereits M. Köhlmoos sieht die Gegenwart Gottes als zentrales Thema des Hiobbuches an. Im Unterschied zur Arbeit von M. Köhlmoos beschränkt sich die Studie von R.M. Wanke nicht nur auf die sogenannte "Grundfassung" des Hiobbuches, sondern behandelt "Texte, die in der Forschung für sekundär gehalten werden" (50). Der Schwerpunkt der Arbeit liegt daher auf der Analyse von Passagen, die im Zusammenhang mit einer Überarbeitung des Hiobbuches stehen: Neben den beiden Himmelsszenen gehören dazu auch Abschnitte, die nach R.M. Wankes Auffassung für die Verknüpfung von Erzählung und Dichtung verantwortlich sind. Auf das Konto dieser Redaktion gehen für ihn ebenfalls kult-, weisheits- und rechtskritische Texte. R.M. Wanke bezeichnet diese erste Redaktion deshalb als kritisch-theologisch. Sie habe das Gottesbild hinsichtlich der Frage nach der Gegenwart Gottes kritisch reflektiert und bearbeitet (76-77).

In den Elihu-Reden erkennt R.M. Wanke eine zweite Redaktion, die sich auch an anderen Stellen des Hiobbuches bemerkbar mache (vgl. 74-76). Beispielsweise schlage sich die Bearbeitung dieser sogenannten Elihu-Redaktion auch in den Freundesreden als Erweiterung nieder. Die Elihu-Redaktion entfalte "die Vorstellung von der Gegenwart Gottes als *Geist Gottes*" und greife das *Motiv der Gottesschau* auf. Das zentrale Thema des Hiobbuches sei also die "Gegenwart Gottes". Dieses Thema durchziehe alle Redaktionsphasen (78).

Die Untersuchung von R.M. Wanke setzt eine Anzahl von Studien zum Hiobbuch voraus, die vornehmlich redaktionsgeschichtlich orientiert sind. Beispielsweise bezieht R.M. Wanke die Ergebnisse der Arbeiten von W.-D. Syring und J. van Oorschot ein (79). Auch die schon genannte Arbeit zum Hiobbuch von M. Köhlmoos, die sich mit der Gegenwart Gottes unter traditionsgeschichtlicher Perspektive beschäftigt, bildet unter anderen einen Ausgangspunkt für die Untersuchung.

Das Neue, was die Arbeit von R.M. Wanke neben der redaktionsgeschichtlichen Betrachtung der Thematik einer Gegenwart Gottes im Hiobbuch hervorbringt, ist die Ausarbeitung einer Konzeption der *Verborgenheit Gottes*, die mit seiner Gegenwart im Zusammenhang stehe. Dieses Konzept ist laut R.M. Wanke bereits in der ursprünglichen Dichtung angelegt: „Die Gottesrede zeigt einen gegenwärtigen Gott, der bei seiner Verborgenheit bleibt“ (413). R.M. Wanke situiert diese erste Fassung in die früh-nachexilische Zeit – in eine Zeit, in der die klassische alttestamentliche Weisheit in die Krise geraten sei.

Das Thema der „Verborgenheit Gottes“ lasse auch die ursprüngliche Hiobberzählung erkennen: Hiob erfahre die Verborgenheit Gottes und beantworte diese durch Anbetung und Schweigen. Die Gegenwart Gottes erfahre Hiob indirekt durch die Gegenwart seiner Mitmenschen. Das Leid werde in der Grundfassung weder erklärt noch bewertet, sondern als grundlos erfahren (417). R.M. Wanke verortet diese erste Abfassung einer Hiobberzählung in die nachexilische Zeit.

Die kritisch-theologische Redaktion, die die Grundfassung der Dichtung mit der Erzählung verknüpft habe, wechselt nach R.M. Wanke die Perspektive: Nicht mehr Hiob oder seine Freunde stehen im Fokus, sondern Gott werde in den Mittelpunkt gerückt. Die Redaktion habe die Bewältigung der Krise zum Ziel und drehe sich um folgende Fragen: Wie ist die Spannung zu erklären, dass Gott sowohl rettet als auch vernichtet, Segen nimmt und gibt, gegenwärtig und verborgen ist (418)? In diesem Zusammenhang weist R.M. Wanke auf die anthropomorphe Rede von der Hand Gottes (יד und כף) hin, die neben der Rede von den Augen Gottes ein zentrales Motiv und bedeutsam für das Gottesbild im Hiobbuch sei (423). Die kritisch-theologische Redaktion ordnet er in die frühhellenistische Zeit ein.

Im Unterschied zur kritisch-theologischen Redaktion verstehe die sogenannte Elihu-Redaktion die Verborgenheit Gottes auch moralisch. Die Elihu-Redaktion betone die Niedrigkeit, die Unreinheit und Ungerechtigkeit des Menschen vor Gott. Dennoch versagen diese Bedingungen dem Menschen nicht, die Gegenwart Gottes zu erfahren. Die Schau Gottes sei unverdient und folglich als gnädige Gabe zu verstehen (427). Aufgrund einer mutmaßlichen theologischen Nähe zu Qumrantexten datiert R.M. Wanke diese Redaktion in das 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.

Trotz der unterschiedlichen Intentionen der Redaktionen sei ein gemeinsamer inhaltlicher Leitfaden hinsichtlich des Gottesbildes jedoch

nicht zu verkennen. Die Verborgenheit Gottes als “*Modus* seiner Gegenwart” (419) ist nach R.M. Wanke ein wesentlicher Aspekt, der das Gottesbild im Hiobbuch prägt (redaktionelle Kompatibilität). Hierin liegt die Innovation der Studie begründet.

Kritisch zu beurteilen ist, wie schnell R.M. Wanke die literarkritische Schere an den Hiobtext ansetzt. Er unterscheidet von Beginn an zwischen einer Grundfassung, einer kritisch-theologischen Redaktion und einer Elihu-Redaktion. Innerhalb der kritisch-theologischen Redaktion unterscheidet er drei weitere Bearbeitungen, die er aufgrund ihrer Form und ihres Inhalts als kultkritisch, weisheitskritisch und rechtskritisch bezeichnet. Diese Einteilung bleibt hypothetisch. Die Argumente, die R.M. Wanke anführt, sind selten nachvollziehbar.

Zur Veranschaulichung seien zwei Beispiele genannt: R.M. Wanke rechnet V. 1, 1a und V. 2 zur sogenannten Grundfassung der Hiobberzählung. V. 1, 1b und V. 1c schreibt er der kritisch-theologischen Redaktion zu und zwar deshalb, weil in diesen Versteilen erzählt wird, dass Hiob fromm, rechtschaffen, gottesfürchtig ist und fern vom Bösen bleibt. Hier sieht R.M. Wanke die literarischen Gattungen und Traditionen “Kult”, “Weisheit” und “Recht” angesprochen (84). Es sei nun aber gerade diese Frömmigkeit, die in den Himmelsszenen der Hiobberzählung in Frage gestellt werde, welche R.M. Wanke deshalb zur kritisch-theologischen Redaktion rechnet. Die Charakterisierung Hiobs in 1, 1b und c bereite also eine Kritik an Kult, Weisheit und Recht vor und R.M. Wanke führt diese darum ebenfalls auf die kritisch-theologische Redaktion zurück. Möglicherweise hat R.M. Wanke darin Recht, dass die Vorstellung Hiobs bereits eine theologische Kritik vorbereitet, was aber hält den Leser, die Leserin davon ab, dieser Intention einer “Erstfassung” des Hiobbuches zuzuschreiben? Formal wird die Differenzierung in Grund- und Überarbeitungsschicht an dieser Stelle schwach begründet. R.M. Wanke führt einzig an, dass der Ausdruck **הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה** (“dieser Mann”) in 1b eine unnötige Wiederholung sei, da Hiob in 1, 1a bereits mit den Worten, “es war ein Mann (**אִישׁ**) im Lande Uz ...”, eingeführt wird. Hinzu kommt, dass die Vorstellung Hiobs auch ohne die Verse 1b und 1c Sinn macht: “Es war ein Mann im Lande Uz, Hiob war sein Name Und ihm wurden sieben Söhne und drei Töchter geboren”. Letzteres trifft durchaus zu: Der Text ist auch ohne die Verse 1b und 1c verständlich. Aber reicht diese Beobachtung aus, um an dieser Stelle eine Bearbeitung zu postulieren? Gilt es nicht, den Text solange als Einheit aufzufassen, bis stichhaltige Argumente dagegen sprechen? Zur ersten Beobachtung ist zudem anzumerken, dass die Wiederholung des Wortes **אִישׁ** nach der Einführung des Namens Hiobs formal nicht derart aufmerken lässt, dass hier eine Bearbeitung behauptet werden müsste. Eine solche Vorstellung ist in der Bibel nicht ungewöhnlich – ähnlich wird zum Beispiel Nabal in 1Sam 25,2-3 vorgestellt.

Ähnlich vage begründet R.M. Wanke auch den sekundären Charakter der beiden Himmelsszenen: Sie unterbrächen seiner Ansicht nach den literarischen Duktus der Erzählung. Hinzu komme, dass die Hiobberzählung auch ohne Himmelsszenen verständlich bleibe (94).

Als weiteres Beispiel sei die Analyse zu 19,7-11 angeführt. Diese Verse schreibt R.M. Wanke der kultkritischen Bearbeitung zu, da sie literarische, inhaltliche und redaktionelle Parallelen zu Texten aufweisen, die R.M. Wanke ebenfalls der kultkritischen Bearbeitung zuschreibt (202). Die Zuordnung zu dieser Bearbeitung erfolgt also vor allem indirekt (207). Die literarische Abgrenzung der Verse 7-11 begründet R.M. Wanke unter anderem damit, dass die Interjektionspartikel $\eta\eta$ am Anfang von Vers 7 eine unnötige Wiederholung zum Imperativ in Vers 6 sei. Das Phänomen lässt sich aber auch anderes interpretieren: Die unmittelbare Folge der Interjektionspartikel $\eta\eta$ auf einen Imperativ verleiht der Rede Pathos. Sie intensiviert den emotionalen Ausdruck, hat also rhetorische Funktion und muss nicht als überflüssig oder gar störend gedeutet werden.

Die vorgenommene Einteilung des Hiobbuches in Grundfassung, Redaktionsschichten und Bearbeitungen wirkt etwas gekünstelt und gewollt: Die Lesenden bekommen eine Übersetzung präsentiert, die durch unterschiedliche Schriftformate im vorneherein anzeigt, welcher Schicht der Text zuzuordnen sei. Eine synchrone Untersuchung, die zunächst den Text als Ganzes wahrnimmt, wäre wünschenswert und gegebenenfalls überzeugender gewesen.

Trotz einer zweifelhaften Methode liefert die Arbeit ein fruchtbares Ergebnis, insbesondere hinsichtlich einer theologischen Konzeption der Verborgenheit Gottes. R.M. Wanke macht damit auf einen wichtigen und zugleich spannungsreichen Aspekt im alttestamentlichen Gottesbild aufmerksam, der bisher derart explizit nicht benannt worden ist: die Verborgenheit Gottes als „Modus seiner Gegenwart“ (419).

Damit liefert R.M. Wanke Anstöße für weitere Forschungsvorhaben. So erscheint es reizvoll, zu untersuchen, ob auch in anderen Büchern des Alten Testaments das Gottesbild 'einer versteckten Präsenz' gezeichnet wird. Anknüpfungspunkte für eine solche Theologie finden sich möglicherweise im Esterbuch, in dem Gott nicht ein einziges Mal erwähnt wird, oder auch in den Psalmen, wo der Beter ähnlich emotional wie Hiob die Ferne Gottes beklagt: „Mein Gott, mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen, fern (bist du) meiner Befreiung, der Worte meines Gestöhnes, mein Gott, ich rufe tags und du antwortest nicht, und nachts — nicht ist mir Ruhe“ (Ps 22,2).

Novum Testamentum

Adrian WYPADLO, *Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markusevangelium. Studien zu einer christologischen Legitimationserzählung* (WUNT 308). Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2013. xiii-514 p. 16 × 24. €139,00

A. Wypadlo, qui enseigne à la faculté de théologie catholique de Münster, publie dans la prestigieuse série WUNT le texte de son habilitation, défendue en 2011, sur le récit de la transfiguration dans l'évangile de Marc. Depuis la monographie de J.P. Heil en 2000 (sur les trois Synoptiques et pas seulement sur Mc), quelques articles ont été publiés sur le même passage, par S.C. Barton et U. Becker en 2001, S. Williams en 2002 et 2003, C.R. Moss en 2004, D. Zeller en 2006, M. Reiser en 2007, J. Eapen et J.P. Batut en 2008; également la monographie de S.S. Lee en 2009 (WUNT 2. Reihe). Mais le seul à avoir focalisé son travail sur la version marcienne de la transfiguration est Wypadlo.

Le sous-titre indique bien la position défendue par l'auteur: Mc 9,2-8 a pour fonction de légitimer la christologie du macro-récit marcien, en particulier le passage du Messie/Fils-de-Dieu par la souffrance. L'approche est quant à elle historico-critique: l'auteur ne remet pas en question la réalité de l'événement (si le récit est influencé par les rencontres avec le Ressuscité, cela ne signifie pas qu'il s'agisse d'une apparition post-pascale déplacée de son contexte originel) et s'intéresse bien plutôt aux traditions qui ont influencé la rédaction actuelle.

Dans un premier chapitre (1-74), il présente plusieurs des thèses qui seront reprises par la suite: Mc 9,2-8, composé de deux parties — la transformation (vv. 1-3) et ce qui la suit (vv. 4-8) — est principalement influencé par les traditions d'Ex 24 et 34 (28-39); l'exhortation finale "écoutez-le" renvoie à Dt 18,15-18 (64); la péricope est aussi en relation avec celle du baptême de Jésus (58-74), qui a la même fonction de légitimation christologique (65, 68).

Le chap. 2 (75-278) est une exégèse traditions- et redaktionsgeschichtlich longue et minutieuse de Mc 9,2-8; l'auteur situe le passage en son contexte (Mc 8,34-9,1), à savoir l'annonce par Jésus de ses souffrances. Signalons quelques points, glanés au long des développements: le rédacteur marcien n'a pas créé ce récit, qui a originellement existé sous forme orale (113); la rédaction actuelle fournit une réponse à la question de l'identité de Jésus face à la croix (114); le rédacteur marcien met en contraste la transfiguration et Gethsémani (131s); les trois disciples rappellent les trois hommes choisis par Moïse en Ex 24,1 (134), et, comme eux, restent à distance, alors que Jésus, comme Moïse, s'avance seul en Ex 24,1-2. Le verbe συλλαλεῖν de Mc 9,4 renvoie aussi probablement à Ex 34,35, où Moïse parle avec Dieu (146-147); Élie est mentionné avant

Moïse (162), et Wypadlo explique l'anomalie en notant la *reversio* des vv. 4-5: Élie-Moïse-Jésus/Jésus-Moïse-Élie, *reversio* qui souligne la place centrale de Jésus (167), il relève aussi l'intérêt des vv. 11-13 pour Élie (170), un intérêt qu'on retrouve en plusieurs points du macro-récit marcien: en 1,2.11; 9,7.11-13 et 15,39 (172-191); en Mc 9,13 Jésus dit à mots couverts que l'Élie eschatologique est Jean-Baptiste et non lui-même (191); quant à l'intervention de Pierre, elle témoigne d'une christologie erronée — en voulant que chaque personnage céleste ait sa tente, Pierre les rend en effet pratiquement égaux — christologie corrigée par le rédacteur marcien (195), qui fait de la transfiguration un récit de légitimation christologique. La typologie mosaïque et sinaïtique du passage fut évidemment possible après la résurrection, ce qui ne signifie pas, répète l'auteur, qu'il s'agisse d'une apparition du Ressuscité replacée à ce moment-là du ministère de Jésus. Voir au v. 5 une allusion à la fête des Tentes est pure spéculation (213); il en est de même pour l'idée d'un Jésus qui serait la tente de Dieu au milieu des hommes (213). Les vv. 7-8 constituent le sommet de la péricope (214-234), pour la théophanie (Ex 24,16; 40,34s), pour la christologie et pour ce qu'elle implique (cf. Dt 18,15-18).

Le chap. 3 (279-395) étudie le motif de la transformation, qui correspond au verbe μεταμορφοῦσθαι, et la description qui en est donnée en Mc 9,3. Renvoie-t-il aux épiphanies qu'on trouve dans les mythes païens ou à la tradition exodale? Comme le verbe μεταμορφοῦσθαι ne se trouve ni en Ex 24 ni en Ex 34, un certain nombre d'exégètes ont pensé qu'en Mc 9,2-3 la transformation et sa description venaient des théophanies païennes. Wypadlo montre que l'arrière-fond est bien Ex 24/34, critique les thèses selon lesquelles le motif serait d'origine païenne et hellénistique, en particulier les religions à mystères. Si le motif ne vient pas directement d'Ex 24/34, une étude de trois passages des œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie, *Virt* 217, *Quest in Ex* 2.27-49 et *VitMos* 2.66-76, où est décrite la transformation de Moïse (326-382), permet de conclure que celle de Jésus et le récit marcien de la transfiguration se situe en continuité du judaïsme hellénistique dont Philon est un représentant typique (392-393). On peut résumer ainsi les analyses du chap. 3: si le motif de la transformation et les personnages renvoient à Ex 24/34 et viennent de la tradition pré-marcienne, en revanche, l'intervention de Pierre et l'insistance sur Élie, en Mc 9,4-5 sont rédactionnelles et sont typiques des intérêts de Marc: la mention d'Élie est due au rapport entre la Passion de Jean-Baptiste et celle de Jésus (cf. par ex. 438).

Le chap. 4 (396-440) revient sur l'énigme du v. 4, où Élie est mentionné avant Moïse et sur sa fonction dans la péricope, mais aussi sur la présence de ces deux personnages célestes aux côtés de Jésus. Les hypothèses ne manquent pas, et Wypadlo les examine (presque) toutes. Pour une première interprétation, si Moïse et Elie apparaissent avec Jésus, c'est parce qu'ils sont les prophètes de la fin des temps et visent à mettre en valeur

la dimension eschatologique de la figure de Jésus; si elle est valable pour Élie — cf. Mal 3,22-23; Sir 48,10, mais on ne dit pas en ces passages que l'Élie de la fin préparera le chemin pour le Messie — cette lecture ne peut s'appliquer à Moïse dont on n'attendait pas le retour à la fin des temps. Celle d'un Moïse et d'un Élie représentant respectivement la Loi et la Prophétie ne trouve pas davantage grâce aux yeux de notre auteur, pas plus que celle faisant de ces deux figures les représentants des justes au ciel, ou encore celle pour laquelle ces deux figures furent choisies à cause des ressemblances établies par les textes bibliques et le judaïsme hellénistique, par ex. Sir 45,5 et 48,7 LXX, car tous deux rencontrèrent Dieu sur la Montagne. S'il ne propose pas d'hypothèse nouvelle pour la présence de ces deux figures bibliques, Wypadlo étudie plutôt les raisons pour lesquelles Mc 9,11-13 insiste sur Élie (412-440): pour l'évangéliste, Élie est le topos de la souffrance; en lui, deux topoi se combinent donc, celui de la souffrance et celui de l'Élie redivivus (422-423). Telle est ainsi l'innovation de Mc 9,13 et le propre de la rédaction marcienne, à savoir la souffrance de l'Élie redivivus (423); pour Marc l'identification de Jean-Baptiste avec Élie a une importance fondamentale pour comprendre l'itinéraire du Fils de Dieu, car il permet d'intégrer la souffrance dans la christologie (427).

Très bref, le chap. 5 (441-444) reprend les différents résultats sous forme de thèses. Une bibliographie abondante (445-479) et un index (481-514) finissent le volume.

Que penser de cet opus? Pour l'approche qui est la sienne, historico-critique, on ne peut que reconnaître la maîtrise technique et le bien-fondé des résultats, pour les questions de tradition et de rédaction. Ce travail patient montre aussi l'utilité de l'approche historico-critique en un temps où elle est plutôt décriée. N'y aurait-il donc rien à reprocher à cette monographie? Si elle s'intéresse à l'histoire qui a mené au texte actuel et si elle montre bien l'intérêt porté par Mc à la figure d'Élie, elle aurait pu arriver à des résultats plus conséquents en discutant avec des études comme celle de P.Y. Brandt, *L'identité de Jésus et l'identité de son disciple*. Le récit de la transfiguration comme clé de lecture de l'évangile de Marc (NTOA-SUNT 50; Göttingen 2002), pour qui la confession de Pierre (Jésus est le Christ) étant erronée, la transfiguration a une fonction de correction (Jésus est le Fils de Dieu). Si les deux exégètes situent bien le récit de Mc 9,2s en son contexte (antérieur), ils ne lui donnent absolument pas la même fonction herméneutique et christologique. Wypadlo semble être peu familier avec la littérature secondaire francophone — sauf erreur de ma part, aucun commentaire, aucune monographie, aucun article écrits en cette langue n'ont été utilisés — et cela a sans doute nui à l'ampleur de ses résultats, car c'est sur cet évangile que les études exégétiques francophones sont les plus stimulantes.

On ne saurait en revanche reprocher à Wypadlo de n'avoir pas utilisé l'approche narrative qui n'a pas les mêmes impératifs. Mieux vaut utiliser

les instruments qu'on maîtrise! On peut toutefois ajouter que l'approche narrative a son utilité, à plusieurs égards. Elle ne peut pas ne pas commencer par s'interroger sur le périmètre de la péricope analysée: Mc 9,2-8 ou 9,2-13? Si l'on considère la transformation de Jésus, on doit évidemment s'arrêter au v. 8, mais si l'on considère tous les indices narratifs, il faut aller jusqu'au v. 13. Narrativement il est d'ailleurs un indice montrant qu'il faut aller jusqu'à ce verset: si Élie est mentionné avant Moïse au v. 4 c'est pour signifier au lecteur qu'il va être question de lui plus loin dans l'épisode (technique de l'*hysteron proteron*). Au demeurant, Wypadlo n'aurait pu interpréter correctement Mc 9,2-8 s'il n'avait — et on ne peut que lui donner raison — inclus les vv. 11-13 dans ses analyses. En analyse narrative, on dira que Mc 9,2-8 décrit l'intrigue de situation (qu'est qui est arrivé à Jésus?) et Mc 9,2-13 l'intrigue de révélation (en toute son extension). Proche aussi de l'analyse narrative sa mise en parallèle du baptême et de la transfiguration (cf. 69), car ces deux épisodes ont pour fonction de faire confirmer par la voix divine les choix de Jésus. En effet, après que Jésus a révélé à ses disciples les composantes futures de son itinéraire — rejet, mise à mort, résurrection — la voix divine intervient une seconde fois, de manière aussi imprévisible qu'au baptême (Mc 1,11), et sa fonction est la même: confirmer, cette fois devant trois disciples, les propos du Fils bien-aimé relatifs aux souffrances et au rejet dont il va être l'objet. L'injonction "Écoutez-le!" donne la grille de lecture de l'épisode: les disciples ont à écouter Jésus aussi et surtout lorsqu'il dit devoir souffrir, eux qui ont une idée triomphaliste de son messianisme! Comme au baptême, où l'humilité l'avait conduit, c'est cet homme acceptant de souffrir et de mourir rejeté que Dieu proclame "Fils bien-aimé".

Ces quelques remarques n'entendent pas remettre en question un travail dont il faut retenir et vanter les qualités, seulement souligner la nécessité où les exégètes sont aujourd'hui de reconnaître les limites de leur savoir, limites qui n'en diminuent pas l'utilité, bien au contraire.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta 25
I-00187 Roma

Jean-Noël ALETTI

Francis WATSON, *Gospel Writing. A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U.K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013 xiii-665 p. 15 × 23. \$48.00 – £31.90

For Watson the story of gospel origins extends into the second century and, perhaps, beyond; he argues that a single yet diverse reception process unites initial responses to Jesus by his first followers with the development of the fourfold canonical gospel and that gospel writing plays a cen-

tral role in this process. Watson contends this canonical perspective can accommodate and relocate many of the individual findings in a fundamentally different and more comprehensive framework. For Watson, it should not be denied that this formation is also the product of contingency; and the rationale for the formation of a fourfold gospel consisting in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John is anything but obvious.

Rejecting a “purely historical” investigation, Watson’s book as a whole could be characterized as an exercise in historically informed theological hermeneutics. He calls for a flexible combination of history, hermeneutics and theology; for these three orientations coexist and work together. Historically, the task is to establish the genesis of the canonical gospel within the whole early Christian gospel production. The gospels later deemed as canonical were at first surely related to gospels which were later passed over, but many textual connections can still be discerned. Hermeneutically, the primary concern is the interpretative implications of the fourfold canonical form, so similar and yet so different. This fourfold canonical form serves to include and exclude. It is likewise important to consider how the “apocryphal” has shaped this modern reception and its relationship to the “canonical”. Watson theologically underlines the mediated character of all knowledge of Jesus over against the contention that we can establish an “historical” figure by abstracting him from his own reception. The Catholic church stipulates that four of the answers about Jesus’ identity and significance are complimentary statements of gospel truth and all other gospel literature could be in error.

Watson begins his study with Augustine whom he finds ambiguous. Augustine tries to account for the origins of the Synoptic Gospels and reflects theologically on the coming together of the fourfold gospel and the relationship between John and the Synoptics. In greater detail Augustine compares the gospels to expose and reconcile their differences; if there is no harmony, things are viewed negatively. The Enlightenment addressed the same concerns but gradually abandoned gospel harmonization; differences were acknowledged, and competing theories were developed to account for them. Watson sees a dismantling of the canonical gospels with G.E. Lessing’s challenge about gospel harmonization in his presentation of Reimarus’ discussion of the ten “contradictions” in the gospel resurrection narratives. During the discussions, John’s Gospel becomes an anomaly; and *Urevangelium*, in one sense seen as “Q”, is introduced as a gulf of a century and a half between the “original gospel” and the three catholic gospels with their regrettable expansions and corruptions.

In response to this situation Watson opts to reframe gospel origins. He asks if there is an alternative account of gospel origins in which the reception and interpretation, normatively stated in the fourfold canonical collection, can be viewed as other than a decline into untruth and illusion. For Watson, any coincidences between Luke and Matthew disappear if

the former has Matthew as well as Mark at his disposal; "Q" would also disappear. One can see how Luke edits and interprets Mark and Matthew on 215-216. Watson then works at de-gnosticizing the Gospel of Thomas (GTh) which becomes a point of departure for a Sayings Collection hypothesis (SCs). The GTh flows from the earlier SCs, used by Mark and Matthew and not able to be reconstructed as a whole. However, items in GTh with synoptic parallels can be traced back to presynoptic collections and may be earlier in one of these sources than the others; the SCs undermines the assumption that Jesus' sayings passed through an extended oral period during which there was no perceived need for them to be written down and also allowed for their wider circulation.

The most important aspect of John's Gospel is its radical christology which asserts Jesus' equality with God. For Watson, extant fragments of the Egerton Gospel contain pre-Johannine and presynoptic material that shed light on the interpretative process underlying the canonical gospel; and there should be no assumption of a canonical/non-canonical divide in early gospel writing. This divide was first attested in the latter part of the second century. The Egerton fragments make it possible to recover a theological trajectory away from Jesus/Moses, a topic of obvious interest to Christian Jews, to a more radical statement of Jesus' relation to God.

Watson next investigates parallel interpretative processes in the gospels attributed to John, Thomas and Peter (GPet). The proliferation of interpretations and reinterpretations naturally raises the question of normativity, for misinterpretations can occur and with disastrous results. The fourfold canonical gospel has been the most enduring and successful normativization. This leads Watson to his "Part Three: The Canonical Construct".

In the East, Eusebius cites Irenaeus and Origen in referring to the fourfold gospel; he knows that the testimony is not universal. Papias does not mention the gospels of Luke or John, and initially Bishop Serapion sanctions the public use of GPet but later calls for its reediting. Clement quotes from much gospel literature but disparages Mark, and only by modifying his statements can Eusebius make him a witness to the gospel's true canonical form. Watson concludes that these data show the fictive or constructed nature of the fourfold gospel. Eusebius and others produce the fourfold gospel.

Irenaeus is concerned that the Johannine Gospel be fully recognized and coordinated with the other three, and he and his successors develop the reception process, the normativization, in the field of gospel writing. There is to be a fourfold gospel, and other gospel writings are set aside. Origen's hermeneutic reflections are a profound reinterpretation of the complex "the gospel", consisting of four "gospels". He is well aware that there is concern to demonstrate the harmony of the gospels on empirical rather than spiritual grounds. He started with this method but later rejected it. Interpretation becomes subordinated to the practical concern for a gospel with shared differences, seen as promising rather than threatening.

It was only in Irenaeus' time, the end of the second century, that people settled on just four gospels; and Irenaeus promoted this by reference to the 'four living creatures' of Rev 4,6-7; up to the time of Jerome these creatures are variously assigned to the gospel writers. This parabolic and visible articulation of the four gospel tradition is particularly effective as is clear from the mosaics and church architecture in Ravenna.

Watson offers no conclusion but rather seven theses on Jesus and the canonical gospel. These theses are followed by an extensive bibliography and indices of patristic authors, modern authors, subjects and scriptural and other ancient texts.

Watson took on an enormous task and demonstrates an impressive knowledge of the early centuries of Christianity. He is correct in rejecting a "purely historical" investigation; for a flexible combination of history, hermeneutics and theology is a real possibility, although the reader might want to nuance the meaning attributed to these terms. Watson gets us thinking and provides much useful information about our four gospels and assists us in appreciating how, despite their differences, our four gospels won the day. He also offers many examples of how some apocryphal gospels might have influenced our four gospels. The extent of this influence is still being studied and deserves a fair hearing.

There are a number of difficulties with Watson's interpretations of the data. One cannot just consider only certain aspects of a question; every relevant piece of data must form part of a given argument. So, when comparing various gospel writings, among other things one must realize that some communities and authors were more concerned with, and loyal to the truer traditions about Jesus and his teachings, and consider the credibility of authors, the date of composition, geographical location, the philosophical or religious context of these gospel writings and the influence of earlier writings. Surely a later writing can contain information which comes from an earlier one, but care must be taken in the conclusions drawn. Watson is not correct to speak of the selection process as arbitrary, fictive or constructed. There were, in fact, criteria present in the process that resulted in our present four gospels. The distinction between the canonical and non-canonical did arise more from textual differences than from their circulation and currency in wider and narrower spheres of the early Christian world.

One intangible but very important aspect of studying gospel writings is what was going on in the Christian communities and their liturgies; for the authors whose writings we do have are, at least in part, coming out of these community celebrations and writing out of these experiences.

For Watson, any coincidences between Luke and Matthew disappear if the former has Matthew as well as Mark as sources for his gospel; if he did, "Q" would disappear. The problem with this understanding is that Watson really does not explain how Luke would not have included in his

gospel at least some of Matthew's other fine and interesting narratives. Also, after this elimination of "Q" it is puzzling why Watson then spends considerable time trying to establish that the Gospel of Thomas (GTh) becomes a point of departure for a Sayings Collection hypothesis. True, Watson wants to reduce the length of any oral tradition period before gospels began to be written, but does his reasoning achieve this? It is likewise not clear that he manages to de-gnosticize GTh; a gnostic gospel which views the material world as evil and so would see Jesus' incarnation negatively would not be very attractive to Christians.

Certainly, our knowledge about Jesus is mediated; and one can ask if the historical figure of Jesus can be abstracted from the reception of this knowledge. Obviously, there are limits to what can be determined about the historical Jesus, but our reception of this data does not justify denying the achievements of the search for the historical Jesus.

Bellarmino House of Studies
3737 Westminster Pl.
St. Louis, MO 63108-3704
U.S.A.

Robert F. O'TOOLE

Dale C. ALLISON, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James* (The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2013. xlix-790 p. 14,5 × 22

Der amerikanische Neutestamentler Dale C. Allison, Jr. (Pittsburgh, PA) — im Folgenden "Vf." — hat einen monumentalen Kommentar zum Jakobusbrief vorgelegt, der seinen beinahe 100 Jahre zurückliegenden Vorgänger der Kommentarreihe von James H. Ropes (1916) mit 790 Seiten um weit mehr als das Doppelte übertrifft. Dieser Zuwachs verdankt sich zum einen der (vor allem in den letzten Dekaden) fortgeschrittenen Forschungslage zum Jakobusbrief, die eine beinahe unübersehbare Fülle an Fachliteratur hervorgebracht hat, zum anderen dem (berechtigten) Anspruch des Autors, nicht nur das der Kommentarreihe eigene Konzept exakter historisch-exegetischer Auslegung im Kontext der Jüdischen und Griechisch-Römischen Welt nachzukommen, sondern auch die Rezeption des Textes in Kirche und Gesellschaft bis hin zur Neuzeit aufzuarbeiten. Dabei spielt nicht nur der interkonfessionelle, sondern auch der interreligiöse Dialog (Verhältnis zum Judentum sowie gelegentlich Parallelen zum Buddhismus [108] und Hinduismus [590]) eine Rolle. Diesem Aspekt der "Wirkungsgeschichte" widmet der Vf. eine besondere Aufmerksamkeit, indem er der Textauslegung ("Exegesis") jeweils einen (über die reformatorische Rezeption hinausgehenden) Abschnitt "History of Interpretation and Recep-

tion” voranstellt, der deutlich macht, wie sehr der Brief im Gedächtnis der Jahrhunderte bis heute in verschiedenen Bereichen von Kirche, Kunst, Literatur, Musik usw. haften geblieben ist. Diese für alle größeren Abschnitte des Briefes bisher noch nicht geleistete Arbeit stellt ein besonderes Verdienst des Kommentars dar.

Der Tradition exegetischer Kommentare verpflichtet, bietet der Vf. einen der Auslegung vorangehenden Einleitungsteil (“Introduction”), in welchem die klassischen Fragen nach Verfasser, Zeit, Ort usw. gründlich und in strittigen Fragen unter fairer Behandlung der Argumente pro und contra verhandelt werden (1-109). Die Thesen des Vf. lassen sich wie folgt zusammenfassen: Der Autor des Briefes ist ein in der Autorität des Herrenbruders — nur dieser Jakobus kann in 1,1 gemeint sein — schreibender Judenchrist (nicht der Herrenbruder selbst, da in diesem Fall die weitgehende Unkenntnis des Briefes in der Zeit vor Origenes und das literarische Griechisch des Briefes nicht zu erklären wären), der sein Schreiben an Diasporajuden richtet (“die zwölf Stämme in der Diaspora” 1,1), in deren Umfeld auch Judenchristen lebten, die sich noch nicht in Abgrenzung vom Judentum definiert haben (“Christ-oriented Judaism” [43]). Der Autor wählte die (unter Juden anerkannte) Autorität des gesetzestreuen Herrenbruders (eine Anspielung an Jakobus “den Gerechten” in 5,6 “remains an enticing possibility” [687]), um das Juden und Judenchristen Verbindende (s. gleich) wachzurufen. Historisch gehöre der pseudepigraphische Brief in eine spätere Zeit, als der ins Achtzehn-Bitten-Gebet eingefügte “Ketzersegen” (*birkath ha-minim*, um 100 n.Chr.) die noch im Verband der Synagoge lebenden Judenchristen bedrohte: Jakobus wende sich in 3,9 (“Gott loben-Menschen verfluchen”) apologetisch gegen diese die (armen) Judenchristen (mit-)treffende Verfluchung seitens (reicher) jüdischer Bedränger. Er suche zur jüdischen Synagoge friedliche Kontakte und werbe dort unter potentiellen Sympathisanten für die Judenchristen, die ihre Identität als toratreue Juden nicht aufgeben möchten. Daher fehlen mit Bedacht spezifisch “christliche” Inhalte (z.B. Christi Tod und Auferstehung, Taufe, Abendmahl), während “theologisch” und paränetisch geprägte Inhalte — Gott als Schöpfer, Gesetzgeber und Richter (1,18; 2,8-11.12-13; 4,12); die Notwendigkeit des Handelns (1,22-27; 2,14-26; 3,13-18), besonders im Blick auf Arme und Reiche (1,9-11; 2,2-4.14-17; 4,13-5,6); die Profilierung von (Mose-)Gesetz (1,25; 2,8.12), Beten (1,5-8; 4,2-3; 5,13-18), Geduld (1,2-4.12; 5,7-11) u.a. — eine Brücke zwischen Christen und Juden bauen (“James is theocentric, not christocentric” [89]). Der Brief entstand um 100–120 n.Chr., da die Kenntnis zumindest von Röm und 1Petr durch Jak sowie (vielleicht) die Benutzung des Briefes durch Hermas (um 140 n.Chr.) wahrscheinlich ist. Die thematischen Parallelen mit 1Clem, Hermas (Vf. sieht in Jak 4,5.9.14b das nicht erhaltene Buch “Eldad und Modad” rezipiert [Herm. *Vis.* 2,3,4], das auch hinter 1Clem 23,3-4; 2Clem

11,2-4 vermutet wird), 1 Petr, Röm und 1 Kor lassen Allison Rom als Entstehungsort annehmen. Das in der Tradition tief verwurzelte Schreiben (Septuaginta, außerkanonische jüdische Tradition, hellenistische Popularphilosophie, Jesustradition [besonders Matthäus], Paulus [Röm, 1Kor, Gal?], 1Petr) bestimmt der Vf. in Übereinstimmung mit einer in den letzten Jahren sich durchsetzenden Sicht als (paränetisch orientierten) "frühjüdischen Diasporabrief", für den Parallelen in der jüdischen Tradition bezeugt sind (Jer 29; EpJer; 2 Macc 1,1.10-2,18 u.a.). Der Brief wird (mit R. Bauckham) in drei Teile gegliedert (A. Prescript [1,1]; B. Introduction [1,2-27]; C. Exposition [2-5]), wobei bestimmende Topoi von Kap 2-5 in 1,2-27 vorweggenommen werden (vgl. 1,2-4; 5,7-11: Geduld in Anfechtungen; 1,5-8; 3,13-18: Weisheit u.a.). Ein das Ganze strukturierendes Ordnungsprinzip fehlt jedoch: "The author quickly moves from topic to topic without developing an overall argument" (81). Den handschriftlich überlieferten Text (nach *Editio Critica Maior*) hält Vf. an mindestens zwei Stellen für verbesserungswürdig: In 2,1 ist ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ zu streichen, und in 4,2 muss man die Erasmuskonjekturen φθοιεύετε statt φονεύετε lesen. Da die frühesten griechischen Handschriften (P20; P23; P100) erst aus dem 3./4. Jh. stammen, müssen die überlieferten Lesarten in der Zeit zwischen Autograph und Abschrift in den Text eingedrungen sein.

Die (die Ergebnisse der Einleitung begründende) Auslegung des Buches ("Commentary") nimmt naturgemäß den größten Raum ein (110-790). Die der Exegese vorangestellten Abschnitte zur Wirkungsgeschichte führen bereits in die Auslegungsprobleme der Texte ein. So wird beispielsweise bei der wirkungsgeschichtlichen Darstellung von Jak 2,14-26 (426-441) deutlich, dass die Frage, wie Jakobus hier zu Paulus steht, offen bleibt: In der Exegese (441-508) trägt der Vf. die (klassische) Position zugunsten einer antipaulinischen Lesart vor: Jakobus attackiere (in Kenntnis von Röm und/oder Gal) Paulus selbst (nicht einen Paulus missverstehenden Paulinismus), wobei er ihn — was für Polemik typisch sei ("du hohler Mensch" V. 20) — verzeichne, indem er ihm Antinomismus unterstelle. Demgegenüber vertritt eine Reihe moderner Forscher die Meinung, dass Paulus und Jakobus unabhängig voneinander durch Rezeption frühjüdischer Abrahamtraditionen geleitet werden. Die Exegese der einzelnen Abschnitte erfolgt gemäß dem Konzept der Kommentierreihe sukzessive zu Wendungen oder Teilsätzen der Verse. Dabei werden lexikalischer Befund, Parallelen zu Schriften der Jüdischen und Griechisch-Römischen Umwelt und Kontroversen der Auslegung auf einem hohen wissenschaftlichen Niveau gemäß dem gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung behandelt. Der die Auslegungen stützende Fußnotenteil greift durchgehend nicht nur auf neuere Kommentare und Forschungsarbeiten, sondern auch — weil das meiste bereits früher gedacht wurde — auf äl-

tere Auslegungen aus verschiedenen Epochen zurück (Origenes, Augustin, Johannes Chrysostomus, Cassiodor, Beda Venerabilis, Ishodad von Merv, Ps.-Oecumenius, Theophylakt, Calvin, Cajetan, Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Wolzogen, Grotius, Benson, Gebser, de Wette, Bengel, Huther u.a.). So wird der Kommentar zugleich zu einer Fundgrube für die Auslegungsgeschichte des Briefes. Anfragen ergeben sich zur Grundthese des Buches.

Die These des Vf., dass der im Namen des Herrenbruders schreibende Autor nicht als Christ an Christen, sondern als Judenchrist an aus Juden und Judenchristen gemischte Synagogengemeinden schreibt, um friedliche Beziehungen zwischen beiden Gruppen zu schaffen, wird nicht jeden Leser überzeugen können. Begriffe und Wendungen, die der Vf. ausschließlich mit jüdischer Identität verbindet, sind mit guten Gründen christlich zu lesen; dass Jakobus also (z.T. durch Übertragung von Israelidentität) nicht die jüdische Diaspora, die Tora oder Gott, sondern die christlichen Adressaten, das Evangelium und Christus meint, wenn er von "den zwölf Stämmen in der Diaspora" (1,1), vom eingepflanzten "Wort der Wahrheit" (1,18.21), von der Synagoge / Versammlung" (2,2), vom "guten Namen, der über euch (bei der Taufe?) ausgerufen wurde" (2,7; vgl. "im Namen des Herrn" 5,14), von der "Parusie des Herrn" (5,7f) und von den "Ältesten der Gemeinde" (5,14; Vf. versteht ἐκκλησία als "a Jewish assembly"; vgl. aber Apg 20,17; Herm Vis. 2,4,3) spricht. Jakobus stellt sich mit Bedacht als "Sklave Gottes und des Herrn Jesu Christi" vor (1,1), und ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ lässt sich trotz der überladen wirkenden Genitivkette in 2,1 nur mit Gewalt (gegen das gesamte handschriftliche Zeugnis) streichen. Ist diese Wendung ursprünglich (so die meisten Exegeten), wird die These des Vf. brüchig, denn Jakobus bestimmt hier seine Identität zusammen mit der seiner Adressaten als dezidiert christlich ("unser Herr Jesus Christus"), so dass nichtchristliche Juden damit nicht erreicht werden konnten. Dass 3,9 den "Ketzersegen" voraussetzt, lässt sich für ein Schreiben, das sonst keinerlei Spannungen zur jüdischen Gemeinde erkennen lässt (vgl. dagegen Joh), nicht wirklich begründen ("die Menschen verfluchen" kann auch bedeuten: "den Bruder verleumden / verurteilen" [4,11-12; vgl. 5,9]). Schwer zu erklären wäre auch, wie der Brief (freilich zögerlich) in den christlichen Kanon gelangen konnte, wenn man sein Profil nicht als christlich erkannt hätte. Die breite Rezeption von Jesustradition sowie von frühchristlichen Traditionen, die Jak mit Paulusbriefen und dem 1Petr teilt, lässt auf ein stärkeres christliches Profil schließen, als der Vf. annimmt.

Der (nach Angaben des Vf.) im Zeitraum von 1997-2011 geschriebene Kommentar stellt ohne Zweifel ein Meisterwerk exegetischer Kunst dar und dürfte die Forschung zum Jakobusbrief entscheidend voranbringen. Die Stärke des Buches, die exegetischen, forschungsgeschichtlichen und wirkungsgeschichtlichen Fragen des Briefes detailliert und umfassend zu

behandeln, macht freilich auch seine Schwäche aus. Die enorme Materialfülle ist nicht nur für Laien schwer zu überschauen. Daher dürfte die Benutzung des Kommentars wohl nur in dem kleinen Kreis derjenigen Fachleute zu erwarten sein, die sich berufsbedingt mit der Erforschung des Jakobusbriefes zu befassen haben.

Saarstraße 2
D-03046 Cottbus

Rainer METZNER

Varia

Ulrich HUTTNER, *Early Christianity in the Lycus Valley* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 85). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2013. xxi-492 p. 16 × 24. €172 – \$223.00

L'Autore di questa monografia, già collaboratore scientifico alla facoltà Teologica della Humboldt Universität di Berlino, è ora Professore di Storia Antica all'Università di Siegen. Questo è il primo volume di una serie intitolata "Early Christianity in Asia Minor" (ECAM), diretta da C. Breytenbach e M. Goodman, a sua volta inserita nella collana "Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity", di cui rappresenta il volume 85. Il lavoro è suddiviso in una sequenza di nove capitoli, che intendo presentare singolarmente in breve.

Il primo (1-26) è dedicato alla storia della ricerca e ai parametri geografici e naturali della zona. Precisato che il fiume Lico, affluente di destra del Meandro, forma una valle a cui appartengono alcune città, di cui le principali sono Colosse, Laodicea e Gerapoli, l'Autore comincia con l'accogliere la distinzione tra *community* (gruppo organico e vitale) e *society* (gruppo unitario più ampio ma più artificiale). La storia della ricerca in materia parte da W.M. Ramsay (1895) e passa attraverso S.E. Johnson (1908-1993) per arrivare all'attuale P. Trebilco. Oggetto di studio sono l'epigrafia, con le centinaia di iscrizioni, l'archeologia, con le basiliche e i monumenti funerari (e a questo proposito non mancano le citazioni di vari ricercatori italiani), e la teologia, basata su alcune lettere paoline, sull'Apocalisse giovannea e su Papiia. Si analizzano poi il clima della regione, le sue risorse naturali, l'agricoltura, la produzione tessile e marmorea.

Il secondo capitolo (27-79) studia lo sfondo storico, analizzato in quattro componenti. Anzitutto si pone l'ambiente culturale del paesaggio frigio, caratterizzato da agglomerati urbani con un dialetto proprio, sopravvivenze del periodo persiano e soprattutto dell'impero romano (cf. il berretto frigio), e la prassi di associazioni commerciali, culturali, familiari. Quanto allo sfondo politico, la relazione più antica è fornita da Erodoto, che descrive l'itinerario di Serse dall'Anatolia centrale al Mar Egeo. Colosse risulta la città più importante. In età ellenistica i Seleucidi fondarono Laodicea e Gerapoli, di cui la prima finì per scalzare l'importanza di Colosse; dopo il 133 a.C. la regione fece parte della provincia romana di Asia (anche se negli anni 56-50 fece parte della Cilicia, di cui nel 51 fu governatore Cicerone). Durante la guerra civile, Laodicea assunse per un certo tempo il nome di 'Antoniopoli'. Una rilevanza particolare assumono poi i culti locali e greci. I più antichi sono quelli di Zeus (dio dell'*omonoia*) e soprattutto di Apollo (di cui non era lontano il santuario di Claro, vicino a Colofone). Questi era la più importante divinità tutelare dei Seleucidi, e i suoi oracoli erano molto ricercati, essendo venerato soprattutto

a Gerapoli. Un altro dio, Lairbeno, è attestato dalla numismatica e dall'epigrafia di un santuario a nord di Gerapoli (dove tra l'altro è attestato lo stesso nome *Affia* presente in Fm 2). Il dio guaritore locale Men è raffigurato con il berretto frigio e una luna crescente dietro la testa in un santuario poco fuori Laodicea. Più importante è la dea madre, identificata con l'Artemide efesina, che aveva come personale sacerdotale i cosiddetti "galli castrati", che irritavano i romani (a questo proposito Huttner avrebbe fatto bene a trattare anche della dea locale Cibele). Segue poi il culto, prima, del sovrano ellenistico, e, poi, dell'imperatore romano a partire da Augusto, con ampie attestazioni. Infine, si trattano le comunità giudaiche. Si calcola che già al tempo di Antioco III ci fossero ca. 10.000 ebrei, e Laodicea doveva essere il centro maggiore. I conflitti con i Greci prima dell'età imperiale cedettero poi il posto a rapporti di simbiosi.

Il terzo capitolo (81-148) è il più lungo e tratta dell'influsso paolino secondo le lettere ai Colossesi e a Filemone. L'Autore procede secondo tre momenti. Anzitutto, ricorda la presenza di Paolo durante il suo terzo viaggio missionario con partenza da Antiochia di Pisidia e, attraversando la valle del Meandro, il suo arrivo a Efeso, da cui durante un soggiorno biennale influenzò anche la valle del Lico. La prosopografia delle due lettere menziona tredici persone (Timoteo, Filemone, Affia, Archippo, Onesimo, Epafrà, Marco, Aristarco, Demas, Luca, Tichico, Gesù Giusto, Ninfa), ciascuna delle quali è analizzata dal punto di vista onomastico e storico. Le due lettere menzionano le chiese di Colosse e di Laodicea, ma non quella di Gerapoli (ipotizzando che vi sia stata indirizzata una lettera a parte); e sulla questione del genere di Ninfa di Laodicea, si opta decisamente per il suo genere femminile. In secondo luogo, l'Autore esamina la lettera a Filemone, datandola negli anni 53-55 (non è chiaro se da Efeso o da Roma), prima del disastroso terremoto attestato da Tacito per i primi anni 60, ma non discute a fondo l'autodesignazione di Paolo come "vecchio" e tantomeno si esprime sulla data della sua morte. Più discussa è la condizione sociale di Onesimo, ritenuto uno schiavo liberto di Filemone, e ciò, secondo Huttner, dovrebbe impedire di trarre dalla lettera eccessive conclusioni sulla schiavitù. L'Autore, inoltre, a proposito del nuovo servizio di Onesimo nei confronti di Paolo e del vangelo (v. 17), si dilunga su analoghe condizioni di altre persone nei confronti del suddetto dio Lairbeno. In terzo luogo, si passa alla Lettera ai Colossesi, che è giustamente ritenuta pseudepigrafica, ma effettivamente indirizzata alla chiesa colossese, benché il mittente sia sconosciuto. Il testo epistolare inizia con una sottolineatura della conoscenza di Cristo, che anticipa non solo la menzione polemica di una certa "filosofia" (2,9), ma soprattutto apre sull'inno cristologico di 1,15-20 ritenuto probabilmente tradizionale, ma di cui secondo Huttner non si può provare che abbia avuto un ruolo nella liturgia di quella chiesa. La celebrazione del ruolo di Cristo nel creato può anche implicare un riferimento politico (specie con l'uso di *archai* supportato

dall'epigrafia), che a mio parere è troppo sottolineato dall'Autore. Buone le pagine sulla cosiddetta "filosofia", riducibile soprattutto a tradizioni giudaiche sulle norme dietetiche e festive, con l'osservazione che, a differenza della posizione mediatrice di Paolo in Rom 14, qui invece quelle osservanze sono rigorosamente dichiarate nulle e vuote. Analogamente, la discussione della lettera sul culto degli angeli suppone un prevalente sfondo giudaico, anche se non può escludere tratti del paganesimo ambientale. Così pure è del catalogo dei vizi in 3,5 e delle virtù in 3,9-14, mentre tipicamente paolina (sia pur coniugata con alcune idee della grecità) è l'esigenza di rimuovere le barriere sociali e culturali in 3,11. La prassi liturgica di cantare inni (3,26) avrà uno sviluppo nei secoli posteriori, ma già prima la valle del Lico documenta la composizione di inni soprattutto ad Apollo come *didaskalos tôn hýmnōn*. Quanto al cosiddetto codice domestico di 3,18-24, condizionamenti ambientali sono documentati a proposito del rapporto moglie-marito, figli-genitori, e schiavi-patroni. In sostanza, la lettera vuole comunicare una condizione autonoma delle comunità cristiane sotto l'unica signoria di Cristo, distanziandosi da gruppi soprattutto giudaici della regione.

Il quarto capitolo (149-183) si occupa delle sette lettere presenti nell'Apocalisse giovannea, una delle quali è indirizzata a Laodicea (3,14-22), dalla quale dista solo 80 km Filadelfia (cf. 4,7-13), e, secondo Eusebio, Papia di Gerapoli avrebbe ascoltato il presbitero Giovanni. Se questi scrive a quelle comunità dev'essere perché egli vi godeva di una certa considerazione. La tiepidezza rimproverata ai Laodicesi si riferisce probabilmente non alla loro fede, bensì al loro comportamento cristiano. Il ricorso a questa metafora potrebbe essere condizionato dalle molte acque presenti nel territorio della città. Il triplice invito a procurarsi oro puro, vesti bianche, e collirio per gli occhi, è rivolto a contrastare la povertà, così come la nudità e la cecità sul piano spirituale, e viene studiato da Huttner con abbondanza di riferimenti (158-177). L'invito al banchetto con l'efficace immagine di Gesù che sta alla porta e bussa (3,20) viene semplicemente commentato con l'iconografia sepolcrale che rappresenta scene di banchetto. La promessa finale sulla partecipazione al trono di Cristo (3,21) è commentata con l'immagine di una moneta recante l'immagine di un tempio tetrastilo con la scritta a "Domiziano Cesare Augusto", anche se l'Autore è ben consapevole che non si debba esagerare la connotazione politica del testo.

Il quinto capitolo (185-211) è intitolato "Filippo e le sue figlie". Dopo aver ricordato che gli Atti di Giovanni accennano a una tradizione sulla presenza del Discepolo prediletto nella Valle del Lico, Huttner si chiede se per caso in quella valle ci sia stata una competizione tra i due apostoli. Papia ci offre la più antica testimonianza della presenza a Gerapoli di Filippo (che almeno secondo Eusebio è un apostolo), ed è seguito da una lettera di Policrate vescovo di Efeso al vescovo di Roma, Vittore (anni 189-

198). In effetti la tomba di Filippo era venerata a Gerapoli, ed essa, insieme a quella di Giovanni a Efeso, doveva fare da contrappeso a quelle di Pietro e Paolo a Roma. Là Filippo dev'essersi trasferito dopo che Paolo lo incontrò a Cesarea Marittima (At 21,8-9), anche se negli Atti lucani egli è uno dei Sette diaconi. In ogni caso il Filippo apostolo e il Filippo evangelista trovarono casa in Asia Minore! Quanto alle figlie, le testimonianze discordano sul loro numero (quattro in At 21,6; tre secondo Policrate di Efeso), ma il dato più importante è la loro attività profetica, al di là del fatto che i loro nomi non si siano conservati. Anche il loro genere non è in questione (come nel caso di Ninfa e di una certa Ammia di Filadelfia presente in Eusebio, *Storia* 5,17,3), così come la menzione di Gezabele in Ap 2,20 è motivata non dal genere ma dal suo riprovevole messaggio. Huttner discute il fenomeno sullo sfondo dei profeti di Apollo Clario documentati dall'epigrafia, prendendone però le distanze. Del resto non sappiamo quale fosse il contenuto della profezia di quelle figlie, mentre invece Papia riporta alcuni miracoli da loro compiuti, anche se il dato non è insolito nell'ambiente. Comunque, anche se Eusebio menziona le loro tombe, esse non diedero origine a nessuna leggenda e non hanno alcun posto negli Atti di Filippo.

Il sesto capitolo (213-271) tratta di Papia e Apollinario, vescovi di Gerapoli. Papia, il cui nome è ben attestato nella regione, fu vescovo tra il 100 e il 130. Huttner studia nel dettaglio il suo scritto *Esegesi dei detti del Signore*, soprattutto per quanto riguarda le fonti, cioè i Presbiteri successori degli Apostoli, tra i quali menziona in specie Aristione e Giovanni, che probabilmente esercitarono il loro ministero in Asia Minore. Un problema a parte, oltre al chiliasmo che gli attribuisce Eusebio, è quello di un *Ur-Matthew* scritto in aramaico, che Huttner ritiene fosse il parere di Papia, nonostante qualche recente proposta di riferire il vocabolo *diálekto* allo stile più che alla lingua. Apollinario, dell'epoca di Marco Aurelio, è noto da quanto ne scrive Eusebio. Questi gli attribuisce una serie di scritti, giunti a noi frammentari, che Huttner esamina uno per uno: una *Apologia*, uno scritto *Contro i Greci* (nel senso di pagani) e uno *Contro i Giudei* (con una polemica non eccessiva), *Sulla Pasqua* (parzialmente sulla linea di Melitone di Sardi), *Sulla verità* (paragonabile alla polemica di Origene contro *Il discorso veritiero* di Celso), *Contro l'eresia dei Frigi* (cioè contro i montanisti che forse si appellavano alle figlie di Filippo).

Il settimo capitolo (273-329) è intitolato "Istituzionalizzazione: ministeri ecclesiastici, sinodi, e concili". Evidentemente, come già il capitolo precedente, anche questo appartiene più alla successiva storia della chiesa che al Nuovo Testamento. Non è documentato un clero alle dipendenze dell'episcopo nella Valle del Lico prima di un diacono Eufronio di Laodicea al secondo concilio di Efeso del 449. Huttner esamina il fatto e l'importanza del Sinodo di Ancyra (del 314), del Concilio di Nicea (del 325), del Sinodo di Laodicea (databile tra il 341 e il 381), e dei Concili del V secolo (Efeso e Calcedonia). La conclusione è che l'istituzionalizzazione ecclesiale, che tra

l'altro fece emergere soprattutto Laodicea, diede un contributo sostanziale nel diminuire i conflitti e nel sentirsi partecipi della chiesa universale.

Il capitolo ottavo (331-383) si intitola "Persecuzione e leggende". Benché il Sinassario costantinopolitano computi come primi martiri Filemone, Archippo e Appia, il primo martire storicamente autentico è Sagaris vescovo di Laodicea, di cui parla la lettera di Policrate a Vittore vescovo di Roma verso la fine del II secolo. Varie iscrizioni pre-costantiniane documentano altri nomi (Lucio Nonio Glikone, Menofilo con la moglie Piste, Ammia e Asclepio, Aurelio Proclo con la moglie Meltine, Trofimo e Tallo, Sisinnio vescovo di Laodicea e il presbitero Artemone che distrussero la statua di Apollo). Una lunga trattazione è dedicata allo scritto "novellistico" degli *Atti di Filippo* (355-371), di cui si analizzano i viaggi, le guarigioni, una discussione sulla Trinità, l'incontro con il governatore e sua moglie, le tendenze encratite, l'accusa di magia, l'evento sismico, un'apparizione di Gesù, gli incarichi affidati a vari cristiani prima di morire. In Colosse (denominata Chone in età bizantina) è pure collocata una leggenda su San Michele operatore di miracoli presso una certa fontana. Anche l'archeologia dimostra che cristiani pellegrini si recavano nella Valle del Lico per essere guariti da varie infermità, e tra tutti spicca il cosiddetto Martirio di Filippo costruito a Gerapoli all'inizio del V secolo.

L'ultimo capitolo (385-393) trae qualche breve conclusione da quanto detto prima. Si tratta della collocazione pubblica dei cristiani nella zona, con due diversi punti di partenza, l'età paolina e l'età costantiniana, che definiscono due diverse forme di "communitization" (per esempio la croce divenne un segno esibito solo nel secondo momento). I gruppi cristiani si costituirono in comunità mediante un patrimonio comune di tradizioni e mediante la loro organizzazione, soprattutto attorno alla figura del vescovo, il principale dei quali divenne quello di Laodicea. Ciò favorì la loro distinta collocazione nella società, tale da maturare una diversificazione verso i Greci/Pagani e verso i Giudei.

Il volume termina con una lunga bibliografia (395-450) e una serie di vari Indici (persone, luoghi, materie, testi citati, prosopografia delle funzioni).

Come si vede lo studio di Huttner è non solo molto ricco per l'indagine sui testi documentaristici, ma anche molto esteso per l'arco storico esaminato che va fino all'età bizantina. Sicché non è facile dare un giudizio critico sull'insieme. Un piccolo dettaglio che rende faticosa la lettura è il rimando in nota dei vari passi neotestamentari citati, invece di riportare le sigle di citazione nel testo stesso. Ma, a parte qualche piccola osservazione fatta nel corso della precedente presentazione, la fatica dell'Autore merita un chiaro riconoscimento di pregio e la congratulazione per l'evidente utilità del lavoro sul piano della ricerca storica.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

The following list mentions all the books on biblical and related studies sent recently to *Biblica*, including those which may not actually be reviewed in this journal. Inclusion of a book in the list is no indication of an editorial opinion concerning it.

Book sent to this journal will not be returned to the senders, even if no review of them is published in it, unless sent at the request of the editors of *Biblica*.

Please address all books, correspondence, etc., to: Editorial Office, *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta, 25, I-00187 Rome, Italy.

Abusch, Tzvi, *The Witchcraft Series Maqlû* (Writings from the Ancient World 37). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. xiv-201 p. 15,5 × 23

Aguirre, Rafael, *La memoria de Jesús y los cristianismos de los orígenes* (αγορα 36). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2015. 190 p. 15 × 23

Alexanderson, Bengt, *Problems in the New Testament*. Old Manuscripts and Papyri, the New Genealogical Method (CBGM) and the Editio Critica Maior (ECM) (Acta Regiae Societatis Scientiarum et Litterarum Gothoburgensis: Humaniora 48). Göteborg, The Royal Society of Arts and Sciences in Gothenburg, 2014. 146 p. 15,5 × 23

Allen, James P., *The Ancient Egyptian Pyramid Texts*. Second Edition (Writings from the Ancient World 38). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. xii-381. 15,5 × 23

Arbiol, Carlos Gil, *Pablo en el naciente cristianismo* (Qué se sabe de...). Estella, Editorial Verbo Divino, 2015. 283 p. 14,5 × 20

Avioz, Michael, *Josephus' Interpretation of the Books of Samuel* (Library of Second Temple Studies 86). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xvii-254 p. 16 × 24. £10.50

Bale, Alan J., *Genre and Narrative Coherence in the Acts of the Apostles*. (Library of New Testament Studies 514). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. xviii-241 p. 16 × 24. £9.75

Beers, Holly, *The Followers of Jesus as the 'Servant'*. Luke's Model from Isaiah for the Disciples in Luke-Acts (Library of New Testament Studies 535). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. xvi-213 p. 16 × 24. £9.75

Berges, Ulrich (übersetzt und ausgelegt von), *Jesaja 49–54* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament). Freiburg – Basel – Wien, Herder, 2015. 394 p. 18 × 24

Bier, Miriam J., *'Perhaps There is Hope'*. Reading Lamentations as a Polyphony of Pain, Penitence and Protest (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old

Testament Studies 603). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xv-249 p. 16 × 24

Bochet, Isabelle – Fédou, Michel (éds.), *L'exégèse patristique de l'Épître aux Galates* (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 197). Paris, Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 2014. 279 p. 16 × 24,5. €33

Boda, Mark J. – Ames, Frank Ritchel – Ahn, John – Leuchter, Mark (eds.), *The Prophets Speak on Forced Migration* (Ancient Israel and its Literature 21). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. xii-224 p. 15,5 × 23

Brueggemann, Walter, *Geremia. Esilio e ritorno* (Strumenti 68). Torino, Claudiana, 2015. 500 p. 17 × 24. €48.

Bullard, Colin Blake, *Jesus and the Thoughts of Many Hearts*. Implicit Christology and Jesus' Knowledge in the Gospel of Luke (Library of New Testament Studies 530). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xviii-210 p. 16 × 24

Corrêa Lima, Maria de Lourdes, *Exegese Bíblica. Teoria e Prática*. São Paulo, Paulinas, 2014. 204 p. 14,5 × 21

Corrêa Lima, Maria de Lourdes, *Mensageiros de Deus: Profecias no Antigo Israel*. Rio de Janeiro, Editorio PUC, 2012. 155 p. 14 × 21

Corsani, Bruno, *Come interpretare un testo biblico*. Quinta edizione (Piccola collana moderna 90). Torino, Claudiana, 2014. 150 p. 12 × 20. €9.50

Cuffey, Kenneth H., *The Literary Coherence of the Book of Micah*. Remnant, Restoration, and Promise (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 611). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xix-379 p. 16 × 24

Danove, Paul L., *New Testament Verbs of Communication*. A Case Frame and Exegetical Study (Library of New Testament Studies 520). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xvi-245 p. 16 × 24. £10.50

Eckstein, Juliane Maria, *Kurz- oder Langvorlage? Anwendung des Idiolekttests auf die in der griechischen Textüberlieferung asterisierten Passagen des Ijobbuches* (Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament 98). St. Ottilien, EOS Verlag, 2015. 176 p. 15 × 21

Edwards, Katie (ed.), *Rethinking Biblical Literacy*. London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. x-218 p. 15 × 23,5. £3,45

Esposito, Thomas, *Jesus' Meals with Pharisees and their Liturgical Roots* (AnBib 209). Roma, G&B Press, 2015. 400 p. 15 × 21. €35

Focant, Camille, *Les Lettres aux Philippiens et à Philémon* (Commentaire biblique: Nouveau Testament 11). Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 2015. 263 p. 15,5 × 23. €34

Fox, Michael V., *Proverbs*. An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Textual Commentary (The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition 1). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. xxii-431-42* p. 16 × 23,5

Gilbert, Maurice, *L'antique sagesse d'Israël*. Études sur *Proverbes*, *Job*, *Qohélet* et leurs prolongements (Études bibliques 68). Pendé, J. Galbada et C^{ie}, 2015. 392 p. 16 × 24. €70

Hafemann, Scott J., *Paul's Message and Ministry in Covenant Perspective*. Selected Essays. Eugene, Cascade Books, 2015. xix-208 p. 15,5 × 23

Harper, Joshua L., *Responding to a Puzzled Scribe*. The Barberini Version of Habakkuk 3 Analysed in the Light of the Other Greek Versions (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 513). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xvi-351 p. 16 × 24

Hasselbach, Trine Bjørnung, *Meaning and Context in the Thanksgiving Hymns*. Linguistic and Rhetorical Perspectives on a Collection of Prayers from Qumran (Early Judaism and Its Literature 42). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. xi-213 p. 15,5 × 23

Hillers, Delbert R., *Poets Before Homer*. Collected Essays on Ancient Literature. Edited by F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp. Winona Lake, Eisenbrauns, 2015. xxi-318 p. 16 × 23,5. \$59.50

Himes, Paul A., *Foreknowledge and Social Identity in 1 Peter*. Eugene, Pickwick Publications, 2014. xvi-224 p. 15 × 23. \$23.07

Hubing, Jeff, *Crucifixion and New Creation*. The Strategic Purpose of Galatians 6.11-17 (Library of New Testament Studies 508). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xiii-282. 16 × 24. £10.50

Jaroš, Karl, *Zeugen auf Stein und Ton*. Inschriften des Heiligen Landes und seiner Nachbarregionen aus Vier Jahrtausenden. Ruhpolding und Mainz, Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen, 2014. 263 p. 16 × 23,5

Lee, Suk Yee, *An Intertextual Analysis of Zechariah 9-10*. The Earlier Restoration Expectations of Second Zechariah (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 599). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xvi-311 p. 16 × 24

Lee, Yongbom, *Paul, Scribe of Old and New*. Intertextual Insights for the Jesus-Paul Debate. (Library of New Testament Studies 512). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. xiv-203 p. 16 × 24. £9.75

Lehtipuu, Outi, *Debates over the Resurrection of the Dead*. Constructing Early Christian Identity (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015. x-224 p. 16 × 24. £65.00

Lundbom, Jack R., *Jesus' Sermon on the Mount*. Mandating a Better Righteousness. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2015. xxxiii-341 p. 15 × 22,5. £32.99

MacEwen, Robert K., *Matthean Posterity*. An Exploration of Matthew's Use of Mark and Luke as a Solution to the Synoptic Problem (Library of New Testament Studies 471). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. xxiii-309 p. 16 × 24. £9.95

Maier, Christl – **Calduch-Benages**, Nuria (eds.), *The Writings and Later Wisdom Books* (The Bible and Women, 1.3). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. ix-333 p. 15,5 × 23

McKeown, James, *Ruth* (The Two Horizons Old Testament Commentary). Grand Rapids, Michigan – Cambridge, U. K., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2015. x-152 p. 10 × 23,5. \$22.00 – £14.99

Niskanen, Paul V., *Isaiah 56–66* (Berit Olam Studies in Hebrew Narrative and Poetry). Collegeville, The Liturgical Press, 2014. xxi-108 p. 16 × 23,5

Orlando, Luigi, *Inni a Gesù Signore*. Alle origini della Chiesa. Bari, Ecumenica Editrice, 2015, 174 p. 17 × 24. €22

Pajunen, Mika S. – **Tervanotko**, Hanna (eds.), *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries*. The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 108). Helsinki, The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015. (6)-287 p. 15 × 21

Park, Song-Mi Suzie, *Hezekiah and the Dialogue of Memory*. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2015. xii-318 p. 15 × 23. £38.99

Penkower, Jordan S. – **Ben-Yashar**, Menachem (eds.), *The Bible in Rabbinic Interpretation*. Rabbinic *Derashot* on Prophets and Writings in Talmudic and Midrashic Literature. Volume Two: Joel and Amos (The Institute for Jewish Bible Interpretation – Sources and Studies). Ramat Gan, Bar-Ilan University, 2015. 923 (4) p. 17,5 × 24,5

Penkower, Jordan S., *Masorah and Text Criticism in the Early Modern Mediterranean*. Moses Ibn Zabara and Menahem de Lonzano (The Jellsehohn Collection Books and Manuscripts). Jerusalem, The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2014. 344 p. 22 × 27,5

Poirier, John C. – **Peterson**, Jeffrey (eds.), *Marcan Priority without Q*. Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis (Library of New Testament Studies 455). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, 2015. xiv-272 p. 16 × 24

Rezetko, Robert – **Young**, Ian, *Historical Linguistics & Biblical Hebrew*. Steps Toward an Integrated Approach (Ancient Near East Monographs 9). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. xx-699 p. 15,5 × 26

Robbins, Vernon K. – **Potter**, Jonathan M. (eds.), *Jesus and Mary Reimagined in Early Christian Literature* (Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series 6). Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2015. x-351 p. 15,5 × 26

Rubel, Georg, *Paulus und Rom*. Historische, Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Archäologische Aspekte zum Letzten Lebensabschnitt des Völkerapostels (NTAbh 57). Münster, Aschendorff Verlag, 2014. xi-253 p. 16 × 23,5

Sáez Gutiérrez, Andrés, *Canon y autoridad en los dos primeros siglos*. Estudio histórico-teológico acerca de la relación entre la Tradición y los escritos apostólicos. Volumen I (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 142*). Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2014. 508 p. 16,5 × 24

Sáez Gutiérrez, Andrés, *Canon y autoridad en los dos primeros siglos*. Estudio histórico-teológico acerca de la relación entre la Tradición y los escritos apostólicos. Volumen II (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 142**). Roma, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2014. pp. 509-1015. 16,5 × 24

Sigrist, Marcel – **Stephens**, Kevin (eds.), *In Memoriam John Strugnell: Four Studies* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique 84). Pendé, J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 2015. 83 p. 16 × 24. €50

Sumpter, Philip, *The Substance of Psalm 24. An Attempt to Read Scripture after Brevard S. Childs* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 600). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xiii-274 p. 16 × 24

Tov, Emanuel, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*. Collected Essays, Volume 3 (VTS 167). Leiden – Boston, Brill, 2015. xxiii-539 p. 16 × 24

Valve, Lotta, *Early Modes of Exegesis*. Ideal Figures in Malachi as a Test Case. Åbo, Åbo Akademi University Press, 2014. 191 p. 17,5 × 23

von Wahlde, Urban, *Gnosticism, Docetism, and the Judaisms of the First Century*. The Search for the Wider Context of the Johannine Literature and Why It Matters (Library of New Testament Studies 517). London – New Delhi, Bloomsbury, T&T Clark, 2015. xix-229 p. 16 × 24. £9.75

Waterhouse, Steven, *A Biblical Look at Unborn Children*. The Sanctity of Life. Amarillo, Westcliff Press, s.a. 38 p. 14 × 21,5

Waterhouse, Steven, *Papias and Matthew*. Papias and his “Elder John”. Amarillo, Westcliff Press, 2014. viii-100 p. 13,5 × 21

Westbrook, April D., *‘And He Will take Your Daughters...’*. Woman Story and the Ethical Evaluation of Monarchy in the David Narrative (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 610). New York – London, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. xiii-269 p. 16 × 24

Witherington, Ben, III, *Reading and Understanding the Bible*. Oxford – New York, Oxford University Press, 2015. xxiii-276 p. 19 × 23,5. £25.99

Wright, N. T., *I Salmi*. Perché sono essenziali (Spiritualità 11). Torino, Claudiana, 2014. 144 p. 12 × 20. €11,90

Yoder, John C., *Power and Politics in the Book of Judges*. Men and Women of Valor. Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2015. xiv-273 p. 15 × 23. £29.99

Yohanna, Samer Soreshow, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syrian Harklean Version*. An Edition based upon the Earliest Witnesses (BibOr 52). Rome, Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2015. xi-196 p. 16,5 × 24. €48

Zappella, Luciano, *Manuale di analisi narrativa biblica* (Strumenti – Biblica 65). Torino, Claudiana, 2014. 247 p. 17 × 24. €19,00

Zwikel, Wolfgang, *Studien zur Geschichte Israels* (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände 59 Altes Testament). Stuttgart, Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2015. 304 p. 14,5 × 20,5